

THE CHURCHMAN

JUNE, 1884.

ART. I.—CHURCH MIDDLE-CLASS EDUCATION.

THE establishment, in the course of last year, of the Church Schools Company, Limited, constitutes the first attempt which has been made by the present generation of Churchmen collectively, to assert for our Church that place with respect to middle-class education which she already holds in reference both to upper and to elementary education; or rather, to win back for her that vantage-ground which she formerly held in regard to it no less than in regard to the education of the classes above and below. The loss of this vantage-ground has been due to two causes—first, the undenominationalizing and secularizing, under the Endowed Schools Act of 1869, of the grammar and other endowed schools which had previously been almost exclusively in connection with the Church of England; and secondly, the large increase in number of the middle classes, and their concentration in new localities, so that the ancient foundations, even if they had retained a distinctive Church character, would have been insufficient to accommodate their children, and, in many cases, would have been inaccessible to them. Until within the last few months all that had been done on the part of our Church to supply the want which had thus sprung up, was represented by a few isolated enterprises on the part of some energetic and zealous individuals. The subject of elementary education, from its more universal applicability, and from the fact that it forced itself upon our attention and touched our pockets whether we wished it or not, had, in fact, almost exclusively engrossed our attention.

It is remarkable that, in that other era of great religious and intellectual activity with which the present century has sometimes been compared—I mean the period of the Reformation—the exact reverse of this was the case. Elementary educa-

tion was then almost entirely ignored; but it is from the sixteenth century that the majority of the 782 schools, containing an aggregate of 36,874 scholars—of whom 9,279 were boarders, and the rest day pupils—which were dealt with by the Endowed Schools Act, 1869, date their origin. Many of them, as is well known, were founded out of the property of the dissolved monasteries; but many others owe their establishment to private munificence. The number in existence at the accession of Henry VIII. seems to have been fifty-three. During his reign sixty-three were founded, and fifty-one more during the short reign which followed. Nineteen date from the reign of Mary, and 136 from that of Elizabeth. Between her death and the Revolution, 286 more were established. Each of the following five reigns, differing widely as they did in duration, yet witnessed the addition of very nearly the same number, thirty, to the list of our endowed middle-class schools, while exactly the same number more have been established since the reign of George III. It thus appears that the rate at which they were founded has been steadily and rapidly declining during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, notwithstanding the continuous growth of the population whom the foundation of such schools would have benefited. There were, no doubt, two causes which, among others, largely conduced to this decline. The legal restraint which was imposed in 1736 on the gift by will, of land, or of money to be laid out on land, for charitable purposes, put a stop to the practice of providing for the foundation of a grammar school by will, which had previously been resorted to by persons who, though not willing to diminish their property for the purpose during their lifetime, were quite ready to devote a portion of it to the object in question, at the expense of their heirs, after their death. And the enactment which was passed at the beginning of Queen Anne's reign against the alienation of Crown lands, put a stop for the future to Royal foundations, to which many of the previous schools owed their existence. It would be easy to suggest other causes which have contributed to the same result; and at any rate the fact is clear, that while our middle-class population has been growing year by year, there has not been a corresponding augmentation in the number of schools for their children.

Meanwhile, however, the subject of elementary education had been gradually receiving increased attention. Sunday schools had been started towards the close of the last century. The National Society for the Education of the Poor was established in 1811, and the corresponding Nonconformist association, the British and Foreign Schools Society, was founded about the same time. The State first intervened in the matter in 1834,

when a small grant was made by Parliament to aid in building school-houses in connection with the two societies ; and from 1839 onwards Parliamentary grants in support of elementary schools have been annually distributed, under the superintendence of a committee of the Privy Council specially appointed to deal with the matter. The working of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, was admirably discussed in *THE CHURCHMAN* of January last. Further reference to it here would be out of place ; but I shall have occasion to allude to it later on, as a warning beacon with regard to middle-class education.

To return now to this, which is the subject immediately before us. In the decade following that in which the impetus was given to the education of the poor by the bestowal upon it of systematic State aid, the education of our middle classes began to occupy the attention, not of the community at large, but of one energetic individual, the Rev. N. Woodard, Canon of Manchester. About the year 1849 he propounded the plan, which has since been gradually developed, of a number of colleges, or societies, which should be legally incorporated, and whose work should be to open and carry on middle-class schools throughout the country, in connection with the Church of England. These schools were to be of three grades ; the upper for the sons of gentlemen preparing for the universities, the intermediate grade for the sons of professional men of limited means, farmers and tradesmen, and the lower for the sons of parents of small means, who yet desired to give their children something above a mere elementary education. The first-grade schools were to be remunerative, and the second and third self-supporting ; but contributions were sought from the public for providing the buildings, just as in former days the structures of the schools now appropriated to the upper classes had been erected by private munificence. In accordance with this plan the whole of England has been mapped out into five educational districts, with the intention of establishing in each a collegiate body to provide and carry on schools within its area. Each college is to be connected with the other four, and is to consist of a provost and twenty-four seniors, and the same number of junior fellows. Of the senior fellows half are to be resident and engaged in educational work, while the other half are to be non-resident and to consist of influential clergymen and laymen. The junior fellows are to engage directly in teaching, in which they are to be assisted by a body of associates in course of training for ordination and for the profession of schoolmasters. Schools of the three grades are to be provided in each district, either by the establishment of new or the affiliation of existing schools ;

and the scheme has been extended to include similar schools for girls. At present the furthest development of these schools has been attained in the diocese of Chichester, in which Canon Woodard made a commencement, more than thirty years ago, by turning his own house at Shoreham into a school. There are now schools of all the three grades in full operation under the collegiate body of SS. Mary and Nicholas, Lancing, of which Canon Woodard is the Provost. At St. Nicholas College, Lancing, some 200 boys are being educated, at an annual cost of eighty guineas. At St. John's College, Hurstpierpoint, there is accommodation for 300 boarders, and the annual charge is thirty-five guineas; while at St. Saviour's, Ardingly, where the charge is fifteen guineas, there are 470 scholars. There is, besides, an associated school for the sons of gentlemen at St. Leonards, and a school for girls at Bognor, at which the annual charge is forty-five guineas. The second of the five colleges has been founded in the diocese of Lichfield, for the Midland district, under the title of the Society of SS. Mary and John, of which Canon Lowe is Provost. The upper-grade school has not yet been founded, but a middle school has been provided at Denstone, with accommodation for 300 boys, and a lower school at Ellesmere, which is designed ultimately to hold 500. For girls there have been started a middle school, and also a lower school, at Abbot's Bromley. Operations have been commenced in the West of England by the purchase of a school at Taunton, offering accommodation to 120 boarders.

It is a melancholy reflection that the usefulness of this scheme of the "Woodard Schools," so grandly conceived, and in course of such successful practical development, should be marred by the taint of Ritualism by which to a great extent it is pervaded. But such is undeniably the case; and, the fact being so, the establishment of these schools, instead of rendering further efforts for the establishment of Church middle-class schools unnecessary, has furnished an additional cogent reason in favour of such efforts on the part of all who would regard it as a calamity that the Church teaching of the young of our middle-class population should, in the future, be exclusively of an extreme High Church type. The necessity of doing something to avert this calamity has not been overlooked; and the foundation of Trent College, and of the South-Eastern College at Ramsgate, has been the result of isolated attempts to establish middle-class schools in which the religious teaching, while strictly that of the Church of England, should be distinctly Protestant in its character. But Evangelical Churchmen have not been prevailed upon, as a body, to come forward and support a general scheme which should be the counterpart of, and an antidote to, the scheme initiated by

Canon Woodard. So far from this, the South-Eastern College itself still urgently requires for its completion the sum of £9,000. This failure on their part has not been from want of solicitation. About fourteen years ago the subject of the Woodard Schools was discussed at a Conference of the Church Association, and a committee was appointed to take it into consideration. This committee recommended that a central fund of £25,000 should be formed, from which grants should be made of £5,000 each to aid the foundation of five large schools in places where local committees could be formed to collect the remaining necessary funds, and to superintend the establishment and carrying on of such schools. Promises for the whole of the central fund were soon obtained, and part of it was actually paid up; but the committee, though they applied to different parts of the country, were unable to find any place willing to form the required local committee, and to contribute the balance of the necessary funds for a school. Nothing, therefore, remained but to abandon the scheme and to return to the donors the contributions which had been actually paid. Two years ago the subject was again taken up, and a drawing-room meeting was held in Queen's Gate, South Kensington, at which a statement was made by the Dean of Canterbury with reference to the educational advantages offered to the middle classes by the Woodard Schools, and the importance of establishing some similar system, based upon the Evangelical principles of the Church of England. This meeting cannot be pronounced to have been a success. The only fresh move in the direction aimed at by its promoters, which has taken place since it was held, has been the establishment of the Dean Close Memorial Fund for the foundation of one or two isolated schools of the desired type.

Meantime, however, a move in a new direction was in contemplation, such as should command the sympathies and enlist the co-operation of Churchmen of all sections alike. The idea of an association formed on a commercial basis, as a company with limited liability, was not altogether new. Besides the precedent of Canon Brereton's County Schools, it had been tried and found successful in the case of the Girls' Public Day Schools Company, founded in 1872; and there were also two other educational companies in the field—the Boys' Public Day School Company, established in the early part of last year, and a company for giving a Church education to girls, founded by Canon Holland. The latter of these, however, was only a small company, its operations being confined to the maintenance of two schools in the West-end of the metropolis, one in Baker Street and the other in Coleshill Street. It was now proposed to form a company which should establish for

boys and girls above the class attending elementary schools, schools of various grades in which a general education should be given in accordance with the principles of the Church of England, at a moderate cost. The idea appears to have been first formally mooted in the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences, in March, 1883, when a resolution was passed that the conferences should be invited to discuss the expediency of taking further steps to extend and promote the establishment and efficiency of Church of England schools for boys and girls of the middle class, including especially within such extension those now comprised in the higher grade of primary schools. A more practical step than merely inviting the different diocesan conferences to discuss the question, was at the same time taken. Arrangements were made for an early meeting of gentlemen interested in the subject, with a view to consider the feasibility of initiating a comprehensive scheme for developing Church middle-class education. The meeting was held, and the outcome of it was the Church Schools Company, Limited, which was formally incorporated on the 12th of July, 1883, with a nominal capital of £100,000 in £5 shares, and with its registered office at 2, Dean's Yard, Westminster, where all information respecting it can be obtained. The object of the Company, as stated in its Memorandum of Association, is "to provide in England and Wales, by the establishment and maintenance of schools, a liberal, practical, and general education upon moderate terms, for boys and girls of all classes above those ordinarily attending public elementary schools, such education to include religious instruction in the doctrine and duties of Christianity, as the same are taught by the Church of England," and "to assist upon such terms as the Council may think fit, and otherwise to promote the establishment and maintenance of schools conducted or to be conducted on the same principles as those on which the schools of the Company are conducted."

The Archbishop of Canterbury entered warmly into the scheme from the first, becoming a shareholder to the amount of £1,000, and on the 20th of July, immediately after the formation of the Company, presided at a meeting in furtherance of it at Willis's Rooms. His Grace, in bringing the subject before the meeting, insisted on the need which existed, and contended that the proposed mode of meeting it was the best which could be adopted. While the upper classes had their magnificent ancient schools, and the poor were amply provided for in the matter of education, partly by voluntary effort, partly out of the rates, and partly out of the Imperial Exchequer, provision for the education of the middle classes was deplorably deficient. In many places farmers and shopkeepers cannot

procure for their children as good an education as their labourers and *employés* obtain. The best plan for supplying the deficiency would be the establishment of Church day-schools—schools in which there should be real religious teaching according to the formularies and doctrines of the Church of England, but in which, nevertheless, the parents should have a right to demand the withholding of religious instruction, so that the schools should not be closed to the children of persons who objected to their offspring being instructed in those formularies and doctrines. The Archbishop dwelt strongly upon the importance of preserving this right, and it is understood that he made the recognition of it a condition of his joining the Company. His views on the subject, and the position taken by the Church Schools Company in regard to it, were, however, speedily challenged by Archdeacon Denison. In a letter to the Archbishop, written in that style of which he is a master, and published as a pamphlet under the title of “The School in England, Century XIX.,” he vigorously denounced the so-called “conscience clause,” and declared that a school in which it was recognised and acted upon could not, in the nature of the case, be a school on the principles of the Church of England. As the controversy on this point is the only discordant note in the otherwise unanimous chorus of approval which has greeted the formation of the Company, it will be well to dwell upon it at some little length.

The position taken up by the Company with regard to it is defined by one of the Articles of Association, which runs as follows :

BYE-LAWS.

78.—The Council shall have power to make, and afterwards to vary, such regulations and bye-laws for the conduct of the schools and general affairs of the Company, as they may from time to time deem necessary ; provided that they do not contravene any of the provisions herein contained, or vary the following standing rules of the Company :

- (a.) That in all schools set up or assisted by the Company, instruction shall be given in the doctrine and duties of Christianity, as taught by the Church of England, but with liberty to the parent or guardian of, or person liable to maintain or having the actual custody of, any day scholar, by notice, in writing, addressed to the head-master or mistress of the school, to withdraw such scholar from attendance at prayer or religious worship, or from any lesson or series of lessons on a religious subject.
- (b.) That all head-masters or mistresses of such schools shall be members of the Church of England.
- (c.) That all assistant-masters or mistresses in such schools shall be members of the Church of England, except in cases specially sanctioned by the Council.

It is to be observed, in the first place, that the right of withdrawal from religious education does not apply to boarders, but is strictly confined to the case of day scholars ; and, in the

next place, that, even as regards day scholars, the right, being inserted in the Articles of Association, and not in the Memorandum of Association of the Company, is not absolutely unalterable. Had it been stipulated for in the Memorandum, it could not have been cancelled without breaking up the Company; but the Articles of Association are always capable of alteration, if the alteration is carried by a majority of three-fourths of the shareholders who are present and vote, either in person or by proxy, at a meeting specially summoned for the purpose of considering it, and is confirmed by a simple majority at a subsequent meeting of shareholders held within a month of the other. If, therefore, the Archdeacon of Taunton were to join the Company, and could persuade a sufficient preponderance of shareholders to adopt his views on the subject, he might effect a reversal of its policy. He prefers, however, to stand aloof and to take up a hostile and condemnatory attitude, instead of making the attempt. He is probably perfectly conscious that any such attempt would be a failure. Much as they might desire that no reason subsisted for importing the principle of a "conscience clause," the great bulk of Churchmen of every section recognise the expediency of adopting it under present circumstances. To discard it would not only imperil the financial success of the undertaking—a comparatively unimportant consideration—but would also impair the amount of good which the Company may be expected to produce. The Archbishop, in his speech at the meeting to which we have alluded, reminded his audience that we have a venerable and successful precedent for its adoption. One important way in which the Church made such progress in the first ages of our era, was that the early Fathers, many of whom taught rhetoric, never dreamt of saying that no disciple should cross their doors to learn rhetoric, who would not also submit to direct instruction in the doctrines of Christianity. It would have been a short-sighted policy if they had done so; and their adoption of a more liberal line of conduct met with its reward in the consequences which resulted from it. The "conscience clause" will probably be more largely taken advantage of by parents of the class for which the Company's schools are intended, than it has been in the elementary schools. At the same time there can be little doubt that its retention will not, upon the whole, impair either the Christian or the Church of England influence of the movement, while it will materially contribute to give that breadth and nationality to the Company's operations which the promoters from the first designed. For the fact must never be overlooked that it is not intended to plant the new schools as competing institutions in places where other middle-class schools, whether on a Church of

England, Dissenting, or secular basis, already exist of a sufficient size and quality to meet the wants of the locality. The Company will only step in where there is an acknowledged deficiency in the provision for middle-class education. In such places it is evident that the existence of the right of withdrawal from religious instruction will render its supply of the deficiency far more complete and effectual. The deficiency will, in fact, be supplied for all, and not merely for children whose parents are willing that they should receive definite Church of England instruction of a type in accordance with the particular views of the head-master or head-mistress who happens to have been appointed to the school in the district. The existence of the Company's schools will, therefore, under the present arrangement, help to form a barrier against the encroachments by School Boards on the domain of middle-class education, and against any other scheme for bringing that education under State control.

If this should prove to be the only result of the establishment of the Company, it could not be hereafter said that the labours of its promoters had been in vain. I have already referred to Mr. Stanley Leighton's review of the results of the Elementary Education Acts in the January number of this magazine. No one can rise from a perusal of that review without the conviction that our present system of elementary education under School Boards and the Education Department is in many respects a failure, and that the effects of its extension into the domain of secondary education would be simply disastrous. In the February number of the *National Review* will be found an equally disheartening account, by Mr. Frederic Pincott, of the results of thirty years' treatment by the State of the educational problem in India. The two papers together furnish strong testimony in corroboration of Dr. J. H. Rigg's valuable article in the *London Quarterly Review* for January last, on "National Education at Home and Abroad." The fact that this article comes from the pen of a leading Nonconformist minister, lends to it all the more weight as a protest against the universal State-regulated secular system of education which some of the doctrinaire Radicals of the present day would gladly see established in our midst. Dr. Rigg discusses the methods and results of education in Germany, France, and the United States, and points out the differences and contrasts which exist in the modes in which the subject is dealt with on the two sides of the Atlantic. He shows that the State-organized secondary education which has prevailed in France for upwards of half a century is a failure, and strongly deprecates any experiment of the kind being made in this country. A perfectly sufficient and far preferable

alternative is, in his opinion, furnished on this side of the Channel by our grammar schools and endowed schools, and our many good private schools, and by the prospect which the new Companies hold out of supplying all inadequacy in the provision made by the existing institutions. It may be observed, in passing, that in his allusion to the Church Schools Company, Dr. Rigg has fallen into the curious error of supposing that its operations are to be confined to the education of boys. While it has been formed with a view to establish seminaries for children of both sexes, it will probably, as a matter of fact, number upon its roll more girls' schools than boys' schools, the deficiency in the present supply of the former being greater than in the case of the latter.

It remains to mention some few details respecting the scope and intentions of the Company, and the ventures in which it has already embarked; which latter, however, owing to the short period of its existence are naturally but few in number. As I have already mentioned, the nominal capital of the Company is £100,000 in shares of £5 each. Of this, £41,460 had been subscribed up to the end of April, partly in fully paid-up shares and partly in shares of which £1 only is at present paid up. As many of the schools will be conducted in hired buildings, involving a comparatively small outlay of capital; and as, where land is bought and schools built, additional capital can, if it is thought expedient, be raised by mortgaging them, the nominal capital when actually subscribed and called up will suffice for carrying on very extensive operations. An increase of it will always be possible hereafter, if a further development of the work is required. The primary object of the Company is the establishment of day-schools, which not only are more urgently called for than boarding-schools, but also can be started with a less outlay of capital and at a smaller pecuniary risk. Schools of various grades are contemplated, with fees ranging from £4 to £15 per annum, according to the character and wants of the places in which they are founded. In the boarding-schools which may ultimately be established, the probable scale of the yearly fees will be from £25 to £50.

The scheme is intended to be in no sense eleemosynary. The Company has been founded with the avowed intention of paying a dividend of four or five per cent. to its shareholders; and, though this of course cannot be expected during the first year or two of its existence, it will not be considered by its promoters to be a success unless it ultimately does so. As a means of ensuring, as far as possible, that a school shall not be established in a locality where it is not wanted, or where it would not be likely to prove a financial success, the Company

require as a rule that before they decide on establishing any school, shares in the Company shall be taken up in the neighbourhood to an amount representing a considerable proportion of the capital required for starting it. This course has the additional advantage of enlisting from the outset a local interest in the particular school, as well as in the Company at large—an interest which is further ensured and maintained by the plan of appointing a local committee to watch over the well-being of each school, under the control, of course, of the Council of the Company. This body answers to the board of directors in ordinary commercial undertakings, and has the general management of the Company's affairs. Besides determining where schools shall be established, it has in its hands the appointment and dismissal of the head-master and head-mistress of every school; and though, subject to regulations by the council, the head of that school has the power of appointing his or her assistant-masters or mistresses, yet the power of dismissing these at any time is reserved to the council. It is evident, therefore, that, if not the actual success or failure of the Company, at any rate the tone which pervades its operations depends, humanly speaking, on the constitution of the council and on the degree of wisdom which prevails in its deliberations.

The Articles of Association provide that it shall consist of not less than twelve, nor more than twenty-four persons, being members of the Church of England, and shareholders of the Company. At every annual general meeting one-fourth, or the number nearest to one-fourth, of the whole body are to retire from office by rotation, and their places are to be filled up by election; the retiring members, however, being eligible for re-election. In voting for members of the council, as upon other questions which may be submitted to the shareholders, every member of the Company has one vote for every share up to ten, an additional vote for every five shares beyond the first ten up to one hundred, and an additional vote for every ten shares beyond the first hundred; and votes may be given by proxy. Ladies are admissible to seats on the council; and among the four who are at present upon it, the names of Miss Beale and Miss Buss are a sufficient guarantee that the girls in the Company's schools will have the advantage of their training being directed by experienced educationalists of their own sex. Endeavours have been made to secure that all sections of the Church shall be adequately represented on the council. The idea of conducting the operations of the Company upon party lines has not for a moment been entertained, and let us trust that it never will. The list of the shareholders contains Churchmen of all opinions; and any attempt by a member of

the council to work the Company otherwise than in a manner satisfactory to the whole body would, it may be hoped, cost him his seat when it became vacant in rotation and he presented himself to a general meeting for re-election. That masters or mistresses in particular schools of the Company should have decided religious views in one direction or another is, of course, inevitable; but it must be remembered that a Church of England parent who desires to avail himself of one of such schools for his children, but objects to the tone of the religious teaching given in it, can take advantage of the "right of withdrawal" secured to him by the regulations of the Company, no less than can a Dissenting or Jewish parent.

Up to the 12th of April last, when the Company completed the ninth month of its existence, it had founded four schools: three for girls, at Surbiton, Durham, and Sunderland; and one for boys in the City of London College Buildings, in Moorfields—a building readily accessible by train from all parts of the metropolis. Of these, however, only the establishment at Surbiton, which had been started in January, was actually in working order at the date in question. The other three have been opened since Easter. In addition to the above, a high-school for girls at Bury St. Edmunds and a middle-class school for girls at Brighton have already been decided on; and negotiations are in progress for the establishment of other institutions, of which it is hoped that the majority, if not all, will be started in the course of the present summer. The enterprises thus already undertaken or now in contemplation bear a very small proportion to those in which the council has been solicited to engage. Pressing applications for the foundation of schools have come from all parts of the country, showing the need of them that everywhere exists. The council, however, have deemed it wise, at any rate at first starting, to err, if at all, in the direction of excess of caution, and not to embark the Company in any scheme which did not hold out good prospect of being a financial success. But really sound and safe opportunities of erecting schools are opening up in all directions; and the power of the Company to take advantage of them will only be limited by the funds entrusted to its disposal. It is for Churchmen as a body to decide whether they will come forward, and by subscribing the remainder of the Company's capital enable it to step in and occupy these openings, or whether they will permit some other religious or non-religious body to come in beforehand, and so lose for the Church of England an opportunity which may never again recur of securing a vantage-ground of influence over the education of the middle-class youth of our country.

PHILIP VERNON SMITH.

ART. II.—THE PROTO-MARTYR OF THE REFORMATION.

"The history of Protestantism is the history of its martyrs."—FROUDE. read 11/6/12

IN all great movements, social, political, or religious, a small cluster of famous names sheds its dazzling light across the pages of history for all time. In the contemplation of these we are apt to lose sight of the great mass of humbler constellations. Whilst the deeds and the sufferings of a few prominent leaders become household words, but a meagre and reluctant tribute is too often paid to the memory of the rank and file who fought and perished in the same cause. It is of one of these lesser stars in the firmament of English Protestantism that we would offer a slight sketch.

During the first quarter of the sixteenth century, a deep feeling of unrest pervaded men's minds in England. That Church, which had grown proud in the strength of a thousand years' more than sovereign authority, was losing her hold upon men's hearts and finding herself unable to satisfy their growing wants and yearnings. The fiery cross, which had been despatched upon its errand from the church-door of Wittenberg, had well-nigh fulfilled its mission. The indulgences, the roods, the pardons, the masses, the "gay garnishing of stocks and stones," were fast losing their power. Men were crying out for something more real, more true.

One of the earliest to utter this cry was Thomas Bilney, a poor student at Cambridge, who, like Luther, had forsaken the law for the Church. Concerning his early life but little information can be gathered. Reared almost from childhood in the classic atmosphere of the University, of small stature and insignificant *physique*, he was notable for extreme temperance of diet and great studiousness of habit. Leading a quiet and unobtrusive life, he was, up to the year 1516, an orthodox member of the Church, rendering to her entire, incessant, and unquestioning obedience. "I spent all that I had," he says of himself at this period, "upon those ignorant physicians, that is to say, unlearned hearers of confession; so that there was but small force of strength left in me (who of nature was but weak), small store of money, and little wit or understanding; for they appointed me fastings, watching, buying of pardons and masses, in all which things (as I now understand) they sought rather their own gain than the salvation of my sick and languishing soul."¹ Again, in a letter to his father

¹ Letter to Tunstall. Foxe, iv. 635.

and mother, shortly before his death, he speaks of his "negligent and reckless life, and especially in my youth, when I neither knew God nor myself."

In the year 1516 (signalized also by the appearance of the famous "Utopia") was published, together with an elegant Latin translation and notes, Erasmus's New Testament in Greek, with which, says the preface, "if we be true Christians, we cannot be too familiar." This work was received with the greatest interest, and was heartily welcomed even by those professors of the stock erudition of the Schoolmen who afterwards bitterly opposed the doctrines which it enjoined. Among the first to procure a copy of this book, "allured," as he says himself, "rather by the Latin than by the Word of God," was Bilney—a purchase destined by Providence to prove the turning-point in his career—the first step in that path which was to lead to the dungeon and the stake. Its perusal occasioned a severe mental struggle—such a struggle as was witnessed in the lonely cell at Erfurt—from which the student emerged filled with a peace such as all the prescribed fasts and penances had been powerless to give him. But let us listen a moment to the gentle Reformer while he himself describes this momentous experience :

At the first reading (as I well remember) I chanced upon this sentence of St. Paul (Oh, most sweet and comfortable sentence to my soul!), in 1 Tim. i., "It is a true saying, and worthy of all men to be embraced," etc. This one sentence, through God's instruction and inward work, which I did not then perceive, did so exhilarate my heart, being before wounded with the guilt of my sins, and being almost in despair, that even immediately I seemed unto myself inwardly to feel a marvellous comfort and quietness, insomuch that "my bruised bones leaped for joy." After this the Scripture began to be more pleasant unto me than the honey or the honeycomb, wherein I learned that all my travails, all my fasting, watching, all the redemption of masses and pardons, being done without trust in Christ, were nothing else but even (as St. Augustine saith) "a hasty and swift running out of the right way."¹

From this time Bilney was the centre of a new movement. But we are not to understand that he became the conspicuous apostle of a new religious system, or posed as an obtrusive Iconoclast. Belief had not yet become crystallized into dogma, and Protestantism was as yet but a protest against a gigantic unreality of human invention. The seed of the "new learning" in the University was sown in familiar intercourse with trusted friends. Nor was there any overt rebellion against the faith hitherto professed: so small was then the number, and so slight the influence of those upon whom the new light was beginning to shine, that to have at once openly braved the

¹ Letter to Tunstall. Foxe, iv. 635.

power of a persecuting Church could have served no purpose. The foundation upon which afterwards rose the fair and stately pile of the Reformed Church was laid in many a quiet hour's chat in the rooms of Trinity Hall (of which college Bilney was a Fellow) or meditative walk by "the reedy Cam."

For a few years, in the course of which Tyndale visited Cambridge, and may have imparted to them some of his own enthusiasm, Bilney and his little company of disciples remained unmolested, a threatened visitation of the University having been expressly vetoed by Wolsey. Meanwhile the circle of inquirers after truth was gradually widening: among them was George Stafford,¹ who discarded the old system of interpretation, and expounded the Scriptures in the original language. Thistel of Pembroke Hall, Soud and Fowke of Benet College (from whom Strype says that Matthew Parker, "being a scholar of the same college, may be presumed to have first tasted of the truth"²), and one Dr. Barnes, an Augustin Friar. Amongst those who were wont to assemble at The White Horse (the favourite rendezvous of the Reformers, situate close to St. John's College, and sometimes contemptuously termed Germany) we also find the name of Myles Coverdale. But they were now to draw within their nets a yet nobler prize. The office of University cross-bearer was at this time filled by an ardent champion of the Church and the old learning of the Schoolmen, and one who had no sympathy with the "new-fangled kind of study of the Scriptures." This was Hugh Latimer, who afterwards, when alluding to this period, called himself "as obstinate a Papist as any in England."

In the spring of 1524, Latimer, on proceeding to the degree of Bachelor of Divinity, was required to deliver the accustomed public discourse on some theological subject. True to his instincts and his training, he selected Melancthon and "the abominable and erroneous opinions lately sprung in Germany" as the subject of a somewhat intemperate oration. Among the audience was Bilney, who, perceiving that the learned preacher was "zealous without knowledge," and guided by some inward monition, went to him and begged him to hear the confession of his own faith. "I did so," says Latimer, "and to say the truth, by his confession I learned more than before in many years." As Bilney poured out to the astonished hearer the story of his spiritual struggles and doubts, and the source of his ultimate

¹ There was a saying in the University, "When Mr. Stafford read and Latimer preached, then was Cambridge blessed."

² Strype's "Parker," book i., ch. i., fol. 1711. He also mentions several other names.

peace and comfort, a new light broke upon the confessor. Was this mild-mannered student the leader of the University "heretics"? Could this be the teaching of that New Testament which he had so strenuously condemned? This confession was indeed a new revelation to one who had sought and sought in vain for peace in the rites and ceremonies and ordinances of an autocratic Church. A study of the despised Scriptures wrought a conspicuous change, and Cambridge saw with astonishment the quondam enemy of the Reformers, like another Saul, throwing in his lot with those whom he had been so eager to persecute. From the time of this remarkable conversion, the future bishop and "little Bilney," as he affectionately calls him, became constant companions. Together they studied the Word, together they went on errands of mercy and charity, together they preached in the hospitals; "for he was ever visiting prisoners and sick folk," says Latimer.

During the years 1524-25, Bilney and his friends continued without active interruption quietly extending their opinions and influence in the University. The former, we are told, for more than a year ate but one meal a day, bearing the remainder of his "commons" to some poor prisoner. On few nights did he allow himself more than four hours' sleep, and he was ever on the alert to check any bad language or frivolity in those around him. So little suspicion was entertained by the authorities, that he was even granted a license to preach in the diocese of Ely. On the Sunday before Christmas Day of the latter year, however, Dr. Barnes preached in St. Edward's Church, belonging to Trinity Hall. Taking his text from the Epistle for the day (*Gaudete in Domino*), in a tone singularly out of harmony with the context, he launched out into a violent denunciation of the Bishops and clergy in general, and of Wolsey in particular. It was not to be expected that this exhibition should pass unnoticed; he was immediately accused of heresy by two Fellows of King's College, and being arrested, was carried to London, where, after examination before the Cardinal, on Shrove Tuesday, 1526, he recanted and bore a faggot before a noisy crowd at St. Paul's, the Bishop of Rochester preaching a sermon against heresy.¹ This display

¹ This same Barnes was afterwards for some time in high favour, especially from 1534 to 1536. In the latter year we find him a member of a Commission appointed for the examination of Anabaptists; and he was also employed on various foreign missions, one of which was the unfortunate project of the King's marriage with Anne of Cleves. He was an indiscreet and impetuous man, ever thrusting himself into an unwise prominence (as when he volunteered as the accuser of the martyr Lambert), and was finally burnt at the stake on Tower Hill, in 1540.

of injudicious zeal by a convert of Bilney's caused the Church authorities to cast very suspicious glances towards Cambridge. Shortly afterwards, indeed, Bilney was summoned to London to answer certain accusations of heresy before Wolsey. The Cardinal, however, was not disposed to treat him with any great severity, and after taking a solemn oath "not to preach any of Luther's opinions, but to impugn them everywhere," he was set at liberty. It seems impossible that he should have submitted to this without feeling that he was giving the lie to his convictions, and that he was undertaking an obligation which he could never discharge. But far be it from us to condemn the weakness in one who was so nobly to redeem his character. The cause of the Reformation was still but young, and the constancy which enabled its subsequent martyrs to withstand even unto the end, was not yet ripe.

Having thus escaped for the present out of Wolsey's hands, Bilney returned to Cambridge, where he rejoined his old friend Latimer. He had not been there long, however, when he started on a preaching tour, in the course of which he delivered several discourses in London, the most notable of which was one preached at the Church of St. Magnus in the City, denouncing a new rood lately erected there. "Pray ye only to God, and to no Saints," said he in this sermon, rehearsing the Litany. "As Hezekiah destroyed the brazen serpent that Moses made by the commandment of God, even so should kings and princes nowadays destroy and burn the images of Saints set up in churches;" to set up lights before these images was no Christian custom, for "Saints in Heaven need no light, and the images have no eyes to see;" for five hundred years there had been no good Pope; they had neither preached well nor lived well, but had one and all borne the keys of simony.

The Whitsun-week of 1527 found him preaching at Willesden, Newington, and Chelsea, then quiet country villages, and he also visited Ipswich and other parts of his native county Norfolk, where he was more than once forcibly pulled from the pulpit by the indignant friars. At the first-named place he would doubtless have some bitter things to say touching "Our Lady of Willesden," then one of the most famous pilgrimage images in England, second only to "Our Lady of Walsingham" and "Our Lady of Pue" at Westminster. Preaching at Christ Church, Ipswich, on the 28th of May, he again inveighed against the folly of pilgrimages, denounced the preachers of times past as Antichrists,¹ and declared the miracles alleged to

¹ In another place he says: "They" (preachers in Popish times) "have also preached evil, which either have wrested the Scriptures themselves,

be done at Walsingham,¹ Canterbury, and there in Ipswich itself, to be but machinations of the devil to blind the poor people. Again, enforcing the great fundamental doctrine of the Atonement, he argued: If He to Whom John Baptist, being more than a prophet, pointed, saying, "Ecce Agnus Dei," were the very Lamb which taketh away the sins of the world, "what an injury is it to our Saviour Christ that to be buried in St. Francis's cowl should remit four parts of penance."² Thus we may gather what constituted the principal themes of this outspoken preacher's discourses: the broad fundamental doctrines of Scripture, the futility of pilgrimages, masses, and images, to bring peace to the soul, and the great truth of the mediation of Christ, were the texts upon which he based those earnest appeals to his hearers, many of whom, we may imagine, were already beginning to doubt the efficacy of the prescribed ecclesiastical *nostrums*. To sum up in his own words, "With all my whole power I teach that all men should first acknowledge their sins, and condemn them, afterwards hunger and thirst after that righteousness whereof St. Paul speaketh."

These heretical proceedings coming to the ears of the authorities, he was arrested and, along with Thomas Arthur, one of his intimate friends, brought before Wolsey and several of the Bishops (West of Ely, Longland of Lincoln, Standish of St. Asaph,³ and others, with Tunstal at their head), being one of the first to appear before this Court, recently formed by the Cardinal for the reformation of abuses in the Church. He was, of course, at once accused of having broken his previous oath; this he was obliged to confess, at the same time resorting to an unworthy and undignified prevarication to the effect that the oath, not having been administered "judicially," was not binding. Being commanded to give a plain answer,

or have rashly gathered them out of old rotten papers, being wrested by others."

¹ Among other relics, the county of Norfolk also boasted John the Baptist's head and a part of our Saviour's crown!

² Deposition of John Huggen, Chief Provincial of Friars Predicants in England.

³ Often contracted into St. Asse. Roy, in his "Satire on the Clergy" (1528), speaks of him as—

"The holy Bishop of Saint Asse,

* * * *

He is a babbling Questionist,
And a marvellous great sophist.

* * * *

Of stomach he is fierce and bold,
In brawling words a very scold,
Mingling venom with sugar," etc.

he conducted his defence with great skill and vigour. Let us glance at a few points in it. Though admitting that many of the Pope's laws might be profitable and necessary to godliness, he declined to express an opinion upon them as a whole, as he had never read them all; "And for those that I have read," said he, "I did never read to the end, and purpose to reprove them." "Can the Catholic Church err in the faith?" asked the Bishops. "By no means," was the answer, coupled, however, with the definition of the Catholic Church as *the whole congregation of the elect, and so known only unto God*,¹ for that otherwise no man should be ascertained of another man's salvation or of his own; and in support of this argument he cited a curious interpretation of Eccles. ix. 1: "No man knoweth whether he be worthy of hatred or love." With respect to images of Saints, he allowed that, being the books of the laity, they were "Christianly set up in churches," but pointed to the prototypes and not to the images themselves as the only true and legitimate object of worship.² From 1 Cor. xiv. he gathered that the people should have the Lord's Prayer and Apostles' Creed in English, "so that their devotion might the more be furthered by the understanding;" he would also have the Gospels and Epistles read in English, quoting St. Paul ("I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue"), Chrysostom, and the example of Bede's translation of St. John's Gospel into English. Pressed as to whether he held that *the whole* Scripture should be translated into English, he replied that, while partly doubting concerning the whole, yet he wished that the Gospel and Epistle of the day might be read in English, "that the people might be made the more apt to hear sermons;" and if it were objected that error might thereby arise, good and vigilant pastors might easily remedy that by putting the interpretations of the Fathers as marginal notes to the obscure passages. Touching the Papal indulgences, he was of opinion, considering the debased use to which they had so long been put, that they were better restrained: upon the observance of the Church's holy-days and fast-days his orthodoxy was unimpeachable. Questioned as to whether Christians might seek restitution by law (*a vexata*

¹ Compare with this Wiclif's definition one hundred and fifty years before—"Sancta ecclesia catholica sit solum universitas predestinatorum."

² Compare Cranmer's annotations upon Henry VIII.'s corrections of the "Institution of a Christian Man." "It is contrary to the Scripture to have any such images of the Father of Heaven, as St. Austin saith, and they be suffered only for the infirmity of the people." "Cranmer's Remains and Letters" (Parker Society), p. 101. Compare also Cranmer's article, "De Imaginibus," Ibid. p. 484.

questio of the Lollard controversy a century earlier), he replied that legal contention was not at variance with the doctrine of Christ and His Apostles; but he would have all true Christians give ear to St. Paul, "Why do ye not rather suffer injury?" and to Christ Himself, "He that would contend with thee in the law, and take away thy coat, give him thy cloak also." Is God the author of the fault as well as of the punishment? inquired his interrogators. "Of the punishment only, but not of the offence," was the rejoinder, supported by quotations from St. Basil and St. Augustine. The exact terms of his answer to the question whether preachers should exhort men to pilgrimages have not come down to us; but we may easily judge the tenour of it from his utterances on other occasions: "You come hither on pilgrimages to stocks and stones; you do naught," he says, to the villagers of Willesden. And again, "The people have used foolishly of late pilgrimages, when for them it would have been better to have been at home!" he exclaims from the pulpit of St. Magnus.

Notwithstanding his efforts, however, and in spite of some earnest and touching letters to Tunstal, from which we have quoted a few extracts, "What through human infirmity, what through the great importunity of the Bishop of London, who set all his friends on him," says Burnet, on the 7th of December, 1527, he was, after three refusals, compelled to abjure.

The day after saw him at St. Paul's, making his symbolic public recantation, kneeling bareheaded with the fagot on his shoulder, while a sermon was preached setting forth the heinous sin of heresy, and pointing to this further signal instance of the Church's power. This painful scene over, he was committed to prison for a year; the rigours of his confinement were, however, not without occasional gleams of brightness, for by the kindness of the gaoler he and a fellow-prisoner were sometimes allowed to take their meals together, and to "cheer one another in the Lord with such simple fare as Papists' charity would allow them."¹ Towards the close of 1528 he was released, and, after repeating his abjuration before the Cardinal, as legate, returned to Cambridge.

For long after his return the gentle Bilney suffered the greatest anguish of mind; his grief at his weakness in the hour of trial was well-nigh inconsolable; it seemed to him as though his self-inflicted wound could never be healed, and he told himself that, in recanting, he had committed the unpardonable sin. It required the constant and long-continued companionship and comforting words of his friends to bind up his broken spirit, and so great was his despondency and

¹ "Narratives of the Reformation" (Camden Society), p. 27.

remorse, that they dare not leave him alone day or night. Gradually, however, he was induced to resume his former occupations, and he might have been seen as of old breathing words of hope in the ears of the sick, or soothing the prisoner in his cell. But during this period a firm resolve was taking shape in his mind; with renewed hope and cheerfulness came a growing conviction that it was his duty to wipe out the stain of his recantation. That humiliating scene at St. Paul's was ever vividly before his eyes, and a determination took deep root that he would one day show that he was "not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ." This purpose he kept locked up in his own breast until the early part of the year 1531, when he called his friends around him and announced his intended departure. Their tears and supplications were alike unavailing; his only reply was, "I must needs go up to Jerusalem;" and, like the Apostle of old, he left them "sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more." Considering that his first endeavours were due to his own county, he went again into Norfolk, where he preached first in households and afterwards in the fields and villages, confessing his former deplorable weakness, beseeching the people not to follow his evil example therein, and exhorting them not to put their hopes of salvation in pilgrimages and prayers to Saints or images, but rather to tarry at home, to give alms, and offer their hearts, wills, and minds to God. From Norfolk he went southwards, and it is more than probable that he visited London, for we have evidence that six weeks before his arrest he was at Greenwich. It was not long before his proceedings reached the ears of Nix, the blind and aged Bishop of Norwich, whose officers at once arrested and imprisoned him. The case was a very simple one. Here was a relapsed heretic, pre-eminently one of those whom the Bishop delighted to call men *savouring of the frying-pan*,¹ found preaching against the priests, and disseminating copies of Tyndale's New Testament. Sir Thomas More was accordingly applied to for a writ to burn him, whereupon the learned Chancellor, to whom heresy was a crime, not content with granting the writ, must needs make the ill-timed jest that "the better course would have been to burn him first and procure a writ afterwards." The trial was short, the sentence a foregone conclusion, and the offender, being first degraded from the priesthood, was handed over to the secular power to

¹ "There is a college in Cambridge, called Gunwell Hall, of the foundation of a Bishop of Norwich: I hear of no clerk that hath come out lately of that college but *savoureth of the frying-pan*, though he speak never so holily." Nix to Archbishop Warham (Strype's Mem. II. 696, edit. 1812).

July 6. 1535 beheaded

be burned. The brief interval between the sentence and its execution was spent in cheerful resignation and constancy. The evening before his death, in the Guildhall, where he was kept, he held his finger in the flame of the candle until it was half consumed, remarking that he well knew the pain of burning. "I constantly believe," said he, "that howsoever the stubble of this my body shall be wasted by it, yet my soul and spirit shall be purged thereby; a pain for the time, whereon notwithstanding followeth joy unspeakable." On the morning of the 26th of August, 1531,¹ he was brought outside the Bishop's Gate of Norwich, to a low valley on the north of the city, called "The Lollards' Pit," this place being apparently selected as affording the best accommodation to the curious and interested populace. Accompanied by Dr. Warner, an old friend, he distributed alms liberally by the way, and on drawing near the place of execution he fervently repeated the Creed, to show that he died "as a true Christian man, in a right belief towards Almighty God." Arrived at the stake, he made his private prayer with a quiet earnestness which seemed to ignore the approaching tortures, ending with the 143rd Psalm. Dr. Warner drew near to bid him farewell, but his utterance was choked with tears. "Oh, Master Warner," said Bilney, addressing his faithful friend with a kindly smile, "*Pace gregem tuum, pascere gregem tuum, ut cum venerit Dominus, inveniat te sic facientem* ; farewell, and pray for me." Then, in full view of the crowds assembled on the surrounding hills, by a death rendered doubly agonizing by its slowness (for a strong wind prevailing at the time blew the flames away from him), he put the final seal upon his faith.

There were not wanting those who studied to defame the Martyr after his death, saying that he had again recanted; "and, when once such a thing is said, they never want officious vouchers to lie and swear for it," remarks Burnet. Even the philosophic author of "Utopia" so far permitted his avowed hatred of "that kind of men" to get the better of his judgment as to assert (upon the authority of certain men of Norwich,² afterwards proved to be worthless), that Bilney had, when at the stake, read a bill of recantation, and that "many days before his burning he was fully converted to the Catholic faith." But the testimony of his friend Matthew Parker, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, who was an eye-witness of Bilney's sufferings, amply proves his constancy even in the last moments.

¹ Various dates are given, but this is on the whole the most probable.

² The statement, however, was only obtained from them after being examined, which word, be it remembered, though it *may* only mean "questioned," was at that time constantly used as a euphemism for the rack.

Such is the brief history of one whose fame has been overshadowed, if not well-nigh hidden, by those who played more conspicuous parts in the great movement of the sixteenth century. True, Bilney's views upon the Real Presence, the power of the keys, and other points, remained those of the Roman Catholic Church; but we should remember that it was only by very slow degrees that Cranmer, Latimer, and other prominent Reformers abandoned many of the doctrines in which they had been reared. Though his undemonstrative energies were for the most part confined within a narrow sphere, yet the influence of his earnest teaching and example, whilst the sun of the Reformation was barely visible above the horizon, was felt even until it attained its full mid-day splendour. Being of a quiet and unpretending disposition, his real worth and sterling qualities were perhaps best known only to his own little circle at Cambridge. The testimony of the most illustrious of these friends may fitly close this sketch of the Proto-Martyr of the English Reformation: "If a man living so mercifully, so charitably, so patiently, so continently, so studiously and virtuously, should die an evil death, there is no more to be said; but let him that standeth beware that he fall not."¹

JOHN P. HAWORTH.



ART. III.—THE SWEATING SICKNESS.

PROFESSOR BREWER'S Prefaces to the four volumes of the "Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII.," which he edited for the Master of the Rolls some twenty years ago, have now been published by themselves in a very convenient form. To the ponderous volumes in which the Professor's digest of the State Papers was contained, ordinary readers could hardly be expected to give much attention; and the Lords of the Treasury consented to the Prefaces being republished separately, "at the urgent request of the friends of Professor Brewer, on account of their literary interest." The Prefaces, it is stated, have "no official character or authority." The two handsome volumes which we have received from Mr. Murray, admirably printed, are edited by Mr. Gairdner; they form a treasury of interesting and valuable information.² To this work

¹ Latimer's Letter to Sir Ed. Baynton.

² "The Reign of Henry VIII., from his Accession to the Death of Wolsey." Reviewed and illustrated from original documents. By the late J. S. Brewer, M.A. Edited by James Gairdner, of the Public Record Office. With portrait. John Murray, 1884.

we hope to return ; at present we glean from it some particulars touching the *sudor Anglicus*, "the English sweat," in Wolsey's time.

The sweating sickness, in the reign of Henry VIII., made its appearance in April, 1516. But its first appearance was in 1485. According to Dr. Caius, a physician who had carefully studied the disease, it was a scourge in some respects more severe than the pestilence. "In the month of August, 1485," says the doctor, in the first year of the reign of Henry VII., "there chanced a disease among the people, lasting the whole of that month and all September, which, for the sudden sharpness and unwonted cruelty, passed the pestilence. For this commonly giveth in four, often seven, sometime nine, sometime eleven, and sometime fourteen days', respite to whom it vexeth. But that immediately killed some in opening their windows, some in playing with their children in their street doors ; some in one hour, many in two, it destroyed ; and at the longest, to them that merrily dined, it gave a sorrowful supper." In one house, it might be, three persons died, or five, or the whole family. The disease began with a fever, followed by strong internal convulsions of nature, with profuse perspiration. "It most did stand in sweating," says Dr. Caius, "from the beginning until the ending."¹ If the constitution proved strong enough to expel the poison, the patient escaped. The sickness was attended with sharp pains in the back, shoulders, and extremities ; the liver was attacked ; pains in the head were succeeded by oppression of the heart, followed by drowsiness, the whole body becoming inactive, lumpish. The rapidity of this malignant disease, as was natural, struck terror throughout the nation. Precaution seemed unavailing ; flight afforded the only chance of security. "If the half in every town escaped," says Caius, "it was thought a great favour." Houses and villages were deserted ; and the wealthy hurried from infected towns to one place or another in the country. Oftentimes, when the sweating began, the sick, without asking about a remedy, gave up all hope of recovery. They yielded without a struggle, seeing how it began "fearfully to invade them, furiously handle them, speedily oppress them, unmercifully choke them ; and this in no small numbers, of such persons so notably noble in birth, goodly conditions, grave sobriety, singular wisdom, and great learning."

According to Dr. Caius, the disease was almost peculiar to Englishmen. It first began in England, and it followed English people. In Calais, Antwerp, and Brabant, it generally singled out English residents and visitors, whilst the native popula-

¹ "A Boke or Counsell against the Sweate."

tion were unaffected. It never entered Scotland. Men of middle age and sanguine complexion, it seems, were most liable to its ravages. The robust, whose food was rich and life luxurious, were singled out, while labouring and thin-dieted men generally escaped.

Various speculations were set afloat, of course, as to the origin of the disease and the best mode of allaying it. A letter from Erasmus to Francis, Wolsey's physician, on this subject, contains some curious details. Erasmus attributed the disease to badly built houses and bad and imperfect ventilation, to the clay floors, and to the unchanged and festering rushes with which the rooms were strewn.¹ He writes:

I am frequently astonished and grieved to think how it is that England has been now for so many years troubled by a continual pestilence, especially by a deadly sweat, which appears in a great measure to be peculiar to your country. I have read how a city was once delivered from a plague by a change in the houses, made at the suggestion of a philosopher. I am inclined to think that this also must be the deliverance for England.

First of all, Englishmen never consider the aspect of their doors or windows. Next, their chambers are built in such a way as to admit of no ventilation. Then a great part of the walls of the house is occupied with glass casements, which admit light, but exclude the air; and yet they let in the draft through holes and corners, which is often pestilential and stagnates there. The floors are in general laid with white clay, and are covered with rushes, occasionally removed, but so imperfectly that the bottom layer is left undisturbed, sometimes for twenty years, harbouring expectorations, vomitings, the leakage of dogs and men, ale-droppings, scraps of fish, and other abominations not fit to be mentioned. Whenever the weather changes a vapour is exhaled, which I consider very detrimental to health. I may add that England is not only everywhere surrounded by sea, but is in many places swampy and marshy" (Erasmus no doubt meant Essex), "intersected by salt rivers, to say nothing of salt provisions, in which the common people take so much delight.

The use of rushes should be abandoned, said Erasmus, and the windows should be made so as to open and shut freely. More moderation in diet, and especially in the use of salt meats, might be of service. Further, "public ædiles," said Erasmus, should be appointed to look after the streets, which were defiled with various abominations.

The population of the towns, as Professor Brewer points out, had been increasing rapidly, without any proportionate increase in their sanitary condition or means of accommodation. The same filthy, open sewers rolled lazily their tribute to the Thames, or left their abominations to breed pestilence in streets unpaved, muddy, and with numerous holes. The fresh-water springs had been gradually diminished, or were monopolized by brewers; the narrow conduits spouted from their pea-shooters exactly the same quantity of pure liquid to sup-

¹ April CHURCHMAN, 1884, p. 23.

ply the wants of thousands as for a century and more had scantily served for tens. "Moreover," says the Professor, "the discipline of the Church had fallen into desuetude." Fasts were apt to be neglected, and pilgrimages (with a month's ride over the fields) were not thought so much of. Yet the neglect of fasts and of pilgrimages, surely, could hardly be taken into account as regards this scourge in the opening years of the reign of Henry VII. It seems far-fetched. Anyhow, when the sweating sickness appeared in a town, it was little wonder if wealthy citizens sought change of diet, with change of place and fresh air. Agricultural labourers escaped; the noble and the rich citizen suffered.

In the reign of our eighth Henry, as was remarked, the *sudor Anglicus* first made its appearance in April, 1516. Its violence abated as usual at the approach of cold weather. It reappeared again in the spring of 1517 with alarming fury, and continuing all through the summer into November without interruption, scarcely ceased in the winter and raged more violently than ever in 1518. Not only amusements but business ceased in a great measure; places of public resort were carefully avoided; noblemen broke up their establishments, and everyone hastened as best he could to isolate himself from his neighbours. "Tell your master," said Wolsey to the Earl of Shrewsbury's chaplain, "to get him into clear air, and divide his household in sundry places." The King moved from place to place—from Richmond to Reading, from Abingdon to Woodstock, and Wallingford and Farnham—every report of the sickness being a fresh alarm; nor were his apprehensions without reason. The plague fell upon the royal household, and carried off the pages that slept in the King's chamber. Every superfluous attendant was dismissed; yet in spite of precautions, three more of the pages died of it, next spring, in the King's palace at Richmond. Ammonius, the King's Latin secretary, the friend of Erasmus, was dining one day with an acquaintance; they had arranged to meet the next day, and ride to Merton to escape the infection. The next morning, before his friend was up, a messenger arrived to announce the death of Ammonius. He was carried off in eight hours. Not every foreigner escaped. Giustinian, the Venetian ambassador, was twice attacked in the same week, and two of his servants died in his house. Foreign ambassadors feared to set foot in England.

During the general consternation, it seems, Wolsey, now Lord Chancellor, remained at his post. He did not escape the sickness; it attacked him again and again, even after a pilgrimage to Walsingham. The King desired him to repair to Woodstock; "for here," wrote Dr. Clerk, "is clear air, which his Grace thinketh ye will like very well." The King also, in his own

hand, sent a letter to "Myne awne good Cardinall," recommending him "to take summe pastyme and comfort." "With all my hart," wrote the King, "I thanke yow for the grette payne and labour that yow do dayly take in my bysynes and maters. . . . The Quene my wife hathe desyryd me to make har most harty recommendations to yow, as to hym that she loveth the very well, and bothe she and I wolde knowe fayne when yow wyll repayer to us." Certainly, all work and no recreation was not expedient. "Always payne can nott be induryd," said Henry; and while his chief Minister took care of the State, the King took care of his own health, indulging less in amusements, however, than he was wont. At the Court, masks and tournaments were at an end for a time; dice, card-playing and discussions in divinity took their place. When the King was staying at Abingdon, Richard Pace wrote to his patron, the Cardinal: "Carding and dicing, for this Holy Week, is turned into picking off [pitching of ?] arrows over the screen into the hall."¹ This Pace, an ecclesiastic of remarkable ability, immortalized by Shakespeare—

Was he not held a learned man?—

might have taken, had not his mind become unsettled, a post of the highest favour at Court, after the fall of Wolsey. At the time of the sickness, he was the Cardinal's most obedient servant.

The absence of the Court from the metropolis at such a time was fraught with evil consequences; trade was bad, and the unruly apprentices were not restrained; the Londoners were jealous of foreign merchants and artificers. Dr. Henry Standish, warden of the Mendicant Friars, the most popular preacher of the day,² was asked by a broker to preach, in his Easter Monday's sermon at St. Mary's, Spittle, for the commonalty against the strangers. Dr. Standish wisely refused; but Dr. Beale took action, and riots resulted. Lord Surrey punished with severity; and the citizens of London treasured up feelings of resentment against the nobility. Dr. Standish's conduct at this time, with his defence of the royal supremacy subsequently, was not forgotten by the King.³

¹ Professor Brewer, vol. i. p. 243.

² Immortalized for his quarrel with Erasmus. He was afterwards Bishop of St. Asaph, St. Asse, or De Asino, as Pace and Erasmus called him. His name occurs frequently with Colet's and Grocyn's among the Court preachers.

³ With all Professor Brewer's remarks on the Friars and the popular cause we can hardly agree. The part taken by Standish no doubt presented him and the Friars in a different light from that in which the religious orders sometimes appear in popular histories. But it is easy

Of cures for the sweating sickness, Professor Brewer has given several specimens. Of the Darcy receipts, one is: "Take endive, sowthistle, marygold, mercury, and nightshade, three handfulls of all, and seethe them in conduit-water, from a quart to a pint; then strain it into a fair vessel, then delay it with a little sugar to keep away the tartness, and then drink it when the sweat taketh you, and keep you warm; and by the grace of God ye shall be whole." Another special medicine for the pestilence includes "half an handful of rew, called herbe grace, a handful marygold, half an handful fetherfew, a handful sorrel, a handful burnet, and half a handful dragons, the top in summer, the root in winter;" these herbs are to be washed, seethed, and strained; a little sugarcandy may be added; "and if it be taken afore the pimples break forth, there is no doubt but with the grace of Jesus it shall amend any man, woman, or child. Probatum est, a^o 13 H. VIII." My Lady Whethell suggests treacle and vinegar tempered together. Good advice, no doubt, was given in another paper: "The man that wol be kept fro that evil, needeth him to keep fro outrage and excess in meat and eke drink." Another paper runs thus:

After a prescription for a drink of herbs.—Another for them that are clerks for to say hit every day with a crosse on the forhed. Per signum tau T. A peste et fame libera nos Jesu. Hic est titulus triumphans, *Jesus Nazaremus Rex Judeorum*. Christus venit in pace, et Deus homo factus est Jesus. In nomine Amen.

Another prescription recommends saying every day at seven parts of your body, beginning "at the ryght syde, under the ryght ere," 7 Paternosters and 7 Ave Marias, with 1 Credo at the last.

The sweating sickness made its appearance again, after twelve years, and this time it was more severe than before. It raged mainly in Kent and Sussex, and the neighbouring counties. "This sweat," wrote Du Bellay, "is a most perilous disease. One has a little pain in the head and heart, suddenly a sweat breaks out, and a doctor is useless; for whether you wrap yourself up much or little, in four hours, and sometimes in two or three, you are dispatched without languishing, as in those troublesome fevers. However, only about 2,000 have caught it in London. . . . I found the ambassador of Milan leaving his lodgings in great haste, because two or three had been suddenly attacked. . . . If the thing goes on, corn

to press the point too far. The learned Professor's remarks about Luther's remonstrances against "Good Works" (vol. i. p. 254) appear to us weak and erroneous. It was in teaching the doctrine of justification by faith (the return to primitive truth which the Church needed so sorely) that Luther gave cautions about "Good Works."

will soon be cheap. The Legate (Wolsey) had come for the term (to Westminster), but immediately bridled his horses again, and there will be no term." A few days later the same ambassador writes, that of 40,000 attacked in London, only 2,000 died.

The terror it occasioned was more fatal than the disease itself. Children were less affected by it than persons of riper age, probably because they were less afraid. Among the sufferers was Bryan Tuke, the King's secretary, one of the few persons at the time admitted into the King's presence. He has described his own symptoms on the occasion to Vannes, Wolsey's Italian secretary. He tells Vannes that his wife has passed the sweat, but is very weak, and an eruption has broken out about the mouth. He put away the sweat from himself nightly, he says (the other people imagined they would kill themselves if they did the same), feeling sure that, as long as he was not sick, the sweat was provoked by the disposition of the season. "When a man is not sick, there is no fear of putting away the sweat in the beginning, and before a man's grease be with hot-keeping molten." According to Tuke, the moisture of years past had much to do with this plague.

The King lost his favourite, Sir William Compton, and William Cary, the husband of Mary Boleyn. When Anne Boleyn caught the infection, the Court was immediately broken up. The King moved to Hunsdon, and then to Tittenhanger (a house belonging to Wolsey), where he remained in a great state of alarm. "I hear," wrote the French ambassador, "he has made his will, and taken the sacraments, for fear of sudden death." He took his meals by himself. He sent pills and prescriptions to the Cardinal, and exhorted his Eminence to "put apart fear and fantasies." At this time, as his letters make quite clear, although he treated Katharine with studious courtesy, his affections were entirely centred on Anne Boleyn. News of her illness he termed news "the most afflicting possible." He wrote to her sometimes in French, sometimes in Italian. He sent Dr. Butts, beseeching her ("My entirely beloved") to be governed by that doctor's advice. As soon as he was certified of her escape from danger, he recovered his usual spirits. From dinner to supper he employed his hours in shooting with the cross-bow; the evenings were devoted to "his book" in defence of his divorce. Seventeen of his letters remain, and they contain expressions of something more than bad taste. Anne Boleyn, at this time, was at Hever, with her father, and how she replied to her "*H.R. aimable*" cannot be told, inasmuch as her part in this extraordinary correspondence has not been preserved. She wrote to the Cardinal, courteously

inquiring about his health;¹ and he—always anxious to conciliate her favour—replied accordingly, and sent her a present. The contrast between the servility with which she addressed the great Minister at the height of his power, and the bitterness with which, according to contemporary witnesses, she pursued him in his fall, is remarkable, but is not, we think, so easily accounted for as some suppose. Wolsey afterwards spoke of her as “the night-crow,”² the cause of all that was most cruel in the treatment which he suffered. As to the King, though he does not appear to advantage at this time, it is right to allow him the benefit of his past career. “With regard to the divorce,” writes Mr. Brewer, “more than half the world was persuaded even then that the King’s cause was the cause of justice and of Scripture; and almost half the world is persuaded that it is so now.” Viewing Wolsey as a statesman, we agree in the main with the portrait presented in these volumes. But when it comes to the Church of England, questions arise not easily answered. Some of his words to the Pope, as Mr. Froude has remarked, are the words of a man who loved England well, but who loved Rome better. All his diplomatic dealings with the Sovereigns, however, were utterly in vain. The Emperor Charles, cold, mean, and false, tempted him with the Papacy, used him, and threw him aside. Further, as regards the Church of England, although Wolsey talked of Church Reforms, he effected nothing. He was at the same time Archbishop of York, Bishop of Winchester, and Abbot of St. Albans; in his palaces, in his pomp and pride, he surpassed the King. Latimer’s phrase of twenty years later, “unpreaching prelates,” has a force which no conservative historian can really weaken. Professor Brewer’s remarks about the monks and the clergy of that period are ill-founded; they may well be compared with the opening chapters in Mr. Froude’s History, or, we may add, with the statements of the Bishop of Liverpool in his admirable volume, “Facts and Men.”³ The period of the

¹ “And as touching your Grace’s trouble with the sweat,” she wrote, “I thank our Lord that them that I desired and prayed for are escaped; and that is the King and you; not doubting but that God has preserved you both for great causes known all-only of His high wisdom.”

² Anne Boleyn was of a dark complexion. The blood of the Ormonds ran in her veins. From her Irish descent she had inherited

The black-blue Irish hair and Irish eyes;

and her hair she wore floating down her back, interlaced with jewels. “Sitting in her hair on a litter” is a feature at her coronation which made an impression on Archbishop Cranmer.

³ In “Facts and Men,” by Bishop Ryle, reviewed a year or two ago in THE CHURCHMAN, we read (p. 116): “It is really astonishing to hear the nonsense talked about ‘merry England in the olden times,’ the ‘medæval piety,’ the ‘ages of faith,’ and the ‘devout habits of our Catholic forefathers.’”

Cardinal of York was one of ignorance, superstition, immorality, and priestly tyranny.

Here and there, we observe, Professor Brewer has made a mistake, and Mr. Gairdner (of whose editorial notes we should have been glad to see some more) gives the needful correction. For instance, in vol. ii. p. 218, we read, "The divorce, if Pole may be trusted, was suggested by the Boleyns and their advisers; *and if Cranmer was one of them,*" a summary process would have been preferred. Again, p. 223, Mr. Brewer writes that "the Boleyns seemed to have been chiefly guided by Cranmer." The editor proves, however, that the "chaplain of my lord of Rochford" referred to, was Barlow.



ART. IV.—THE NORTHERN CONVOCATION AND THE DIACONATE.

THE long dark lane has reached its "turning," and that one from whence we seem to discern daylight at the end. The Diaconate is at last declared open. So sounded the silver trumpet of the Upper House of the Southern Convocation, which now finds its exact echo in a united session of the Northern. Indeed, the report of the Committee on this great question in the latter may be said to have given the key-note to both resolutions; which we observe with thankfulness to have been unanimous. So widespread is the conviction that the pressing needs of the Church, whatever else they may require in the way of Lay agency, require beyond dispute this—the relief of our overburdened clergy by the increase of ministrations within the Sanctuary. Nor is this conviction the less remarkable because it has been reached by slow degrees, and, notwithstanding side-winds, by a growing harmony among men of different schools of thought. From the veteran Bishop of Winchester, who for thirty years has advocated such an enlargement of the Diaconate, to the Dean of Ripon and Canon Jackson, the Nestor of the movement at York, there is positively no difference of view, even as regards the details of this proposal.

Another noticeable feature in the conclusion is (as Dean Fremantle observed), that it was arrived at in the Southern Upper House *indirectly*, through a preliminary conference in London between the Committees of the two Convocations. These met, indeed, on the Diaconate; but merely as a part, and, in the eyes of many of the Southern Committee, a very secondary part, of a larger scheme of Readers. Yet the result

was, to the surprise of all, a *unanimous* verdict in the Upper House in favour of the Extended Diaconate; whereas certain points in the Reader scheme were hotly contested on legal and other grounds, and left virtually undecided. The secret of this preference lies, as we must believe, in the simplicity as well as unimpeachable orthodoxy of the resolution on the Diaconate. It will be seen by examining¹ its cautious phraseology that it asks for no change in the law, but simply urges upon the Bishops the necessity of exercising their inherent right, and opening wider the doors of admission, so that volunteers or senior men of established character and approved spiritual gifts may be no longer debarred from responding to that call to the ministry which may have come to them at whatever age; nor tempted by the undue restrictions of our Church to drift away (as the Dean of Ripon forcibly put it) to the voluntary evangelizing agencies of Nonconformity.

Again, while explicit and emphatic on the overwhelming need of an increased Diaconate, the resolution abstains from defining too closely either the "other means of living," or the "competent knowledge of Holy Scripture, of the Book of Common Prayer, and of theology in general;" thus leaving it entirely to the discretion of the individual Bishop what modicum of learning he will require, and whether he discards (as would the Bishop of Newcastle) the man secularly employed, or admits him, as would the Bishop of Durham, who has never objected on principle to the secular avocation,² and, moreover, pledges himself (a most graceful concession) to a loyal carrying out of the Extension.

We propose briefly to review the debate at York; and then

¹ The text of the Resolution is as follows:

"That this House is of opinion that, in view of the overwhelming need of increase in the number of the Ministry, and the impossibility of providing sufficient endowments for the purpose, it is expedient to ordain to the office of Deacon men possessing other means of living, who are willing to aid the clergy gratuitously; provided that they be tried and examined according to the Preface to the Ordinal, and in particular be found to possess a competent knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, of the Book of Common Prayer, and of theology in general; provided also that they be in no case admitted to the Priesthood unless they can pass all the examinations which are required in the case of other candidates for that office, and that they shall have devoted their whole time to spiritual labour for not less than four years, unless they are graduates before they present themselves for these examinations."

² See, for instance, *THE CHURCHMAN*, vol. vii., p. 351. In his Charge, Bishop Lightfoot said: "I do not see how I can find fault with the pursuit of secular avocations in the Ministers of a Church whose chief Apostle was a tentmaker. Precedents in later ages are sufficiently frequent to justify this combination of the spiritual office with the secular work."

draw some practical deductions as regards the future working of the measure.

The subject had been so thoroughly talked out on previous occasions that little of novelty could be expected on the affirmative side. Nevertheless, the Bishop of Manchester, who, as chairman of the Joint Committee, presented its report on Lay Readers and the Diaconate, brought out in strong relief, as against the Southern scheme of a superior class of Lay Readers, the conviction of the York delegates, that no such Readers could fully meet the present necessities of the Church. As to the proposed appendix to that scheme, which would allow these Laymen to officiate in consecrated buildings, his Committee judged it "neither legal nor desirable." Deacons alone can do Deacons' work; and more Deacons, therefore, whether *in transitu* or in permanence, were urgently required. The pressure followed us up to the Holy Table, where, as he had himself found this last Easter, the clergy fell lamentably short in proportion to the communicants. Many an over-worked priest will echo the truth of the Bishop's remark. Indeed, there is hardly a stronger argument for increasing the staff of clergy, *i.e.*, for ordaining more Deacons, than this. Multiply Readers as you will, they do but make the more work for the Ministry proper. A successful Mission near London, conducted by a gifted Layman (we write with a case in view), sends up Sunday after Sunday its one hundred communicants to the parish church. In other words, that Layman and his faithful band increase the work of the Sanctuary to the extent of another Deacon. Why should not he himself be the man? Then, by the simple expedient of allowing him Deacon's Orders, this godly Reader would minister the Word of Life and the Cup of Salvation to his own converts within the holy walls, and strengthen the drooping hands of the parish clergy, while he himself would go forth to his out-door labours, not only an Evangelist, but, like Philip of Cæsarea, a Deacon-Evangelist, how greatly strengthened by the laying-on of hands!

In view of this obvious and sacred fact, we almost shrink from recording one Bishop's counter-opinion expressed at York; namely, that such a man would be weakened, *quâ* no longer Layman, in his influence with the world. Familiar enough is the proverb, "Example better than precept." But there is something novel, not to say startling, in the prejudication, "Lay example and ministration better than Ordained." Fancy the early Church thus arguing with respect to an Origen! and yet the Laity in the Church needed then, fully as much as now, the godly example of the Layman.

In this connexion—although three other speakers inter-

vened—we prefer to notice next the speech of the Dean of Ripon. Strongly and clearly in favour of the Extension, he advocates it chiefly on this ground, that Ordination alone can meet the present need, and that to propose other than spiritual persons, lawfully called and sent, for the work of the Sanctuary, argues a want of confidence alike in Holy Orders and in the Divine call. “If we believe,” he asks, “in a Divine call to the office of the Ministry, why restrict this gracious work of the Holy Spirit to men under thirty or forty years of age? In the mysterious and sovereign providence of God, men may be chosen and called to the office at thirty-five, forty-five, or even after fifty years of age; and there seems to be no reason why they should not undertake the work of a Deacon, and do it well, better probably than their juniors; going forth in many cases as went St. Paul, taking nothing of the Church. And in virtue of having thus solemnly received the outward sign and seal of their holy call, they will experience a sympathy of brotherhood and social equality, fencing them alike against mutual rivalries and against temptations to assume an independent attitude, to which the licensed Layman would be far more exposed.”

A lively episode in the debate on the first day was the passage of arms between the Bishop of Liverpool and Canon Trevor. The former, strange as it may appear, is so afraid of the risks involved in having “Deacons and Deacons,” that he prefers, as an alternative, an order of Subdeacons. This, as the Canon caustically remarked, would be to add an order to the unalterable threefold Ministry, and that not only an unscriptural order, but a Popish order. Beyond doubt, the medieval Subdeacon was (to quote the able appendix to the Report of the Exeter Conference) a “mere ritualistic accessory” in the Roman Church, “bearing the chalice and the dish at Mass.” The Bishop’s vulnerable point was obvious. His Subdeacons were a well-meant contribution; but, like the white tents and horses of Rhesus bringing succour to beleaguered Troy, they were too conspicuous. And the Canon, like another Diomed, pounced upon them by the way:

Ardentesque avertit equos in castra, priusquam
Pabula gustassent Trojæ, Xanthumque bibissent.

Canon Tristram, resuming the debate, saw no reason, from the law of the Church or the land, why the Diaconate should not be permanent in some, and in others a transitory office on the way to the Priesthood. The House should encourage and urge the Bishops to admit to Holy Orders men who possessed great spiritual qualifications and gifts, but who were unable to devote their whole time to the work. He maintained that no

such entire self-devotion was demanded by the Church of the Deacon, as it is of the Priest. In Syria and Armenia he had himself seen the clergy following the plough's tail. And in the Middle Ages, if a Deacon's stipend did not amount to so many nobles, he might adopt some other calling, provided that he did not set his mind on filthy lucre. This speaker's valuable suggestion, that the oversight of these Deacons would be a "splendid archidiaconal function," would, if adopted, be a real relief to the Bishops under their increased responsibilities, as well as a fit revival of ancient practice *pari passu* with that of the primitive Diaconate itself.¹

The President, the Archbishop of York, though not very sanguine as to its producing any very great results, could not obstruct, or vote against, a resolution unanimously adopted by Canterbury. He foresaw difficulties, but none beyond such as the Bishops were well able to guard against. Even the repeal of an Act of Parliament, forbidding Deacons to trade, needed only to be asked of the Legislature. And as to the scholarship required of Deacons in examination, it was nothing very appalling, nor in itself decisive of the bad or the good parish clergyman.

In welcoming this powerful voice, which has at last spoken and not against us, we rejoice especially in his supplementary observations next day on the subject of Lay Readers. Then his Grace distinctly denied the right of any Upper Reader, licensed or unlicensed, to invade by preaching or ministering the services of the Church, which are limited to Deacons and Priests. Very soon, were such encroachment permitted, would the congregation begin to think it did not matter whether a man was ordained or not. For the necessary result of putting a very zealous Layman alongside an average curate in the Church would be to obliterate the respect at present felt for Holy Orders. Moreover, the thing was illegal. Here the Archbishop emphatically pronounced in favour of Sir Fitz-James Stephens' opinion, given by Mr. Sydney Gedge in *THE CHURCHMAN* of last September. The Twenty-third Article, he said, taken in connexion with the terms of the Ordinal, clearly limited the "lawful calling and sending" to Ordination; and as clearly implied that none but Deacons or Priests could preach or minister in churches. Nothing short of some fresh power and an essential alteration of the Act of Uniformity, even as it now stands, could effect an enlargement. What is this (our readers will remark) but an indirect acceptance of

¹ The Archdeacon's office of old bore a special relation to deacons and their oversight. He was also the Bishop's immediate minister and attendant.

the *only enlargement possible in the functions of God's House*—an Enlargement or Extension of the Diaconate?

The Bishop of Durham was the next speaker. For many months his attitude towards the question has been by no means easy to understand. More avowedly in favour of the principles of the measure than many even of its supporters, he has, nevertheless, held aloof from it in undisguised mistrust of its expediency. It now appears that he views it as a bar to the development of the ministerial agencies of the Church in the direction of Lay-help. "He feared that, if the House allowed itself to be absorbed in the one idea of the Diaconate, it would be only following a will-o'-the-wisp, and neglecting a real substantial improvement in our Church organization." Next day he repeated this argument. "The great need of the English Church was to employ Laymen as Laymen: this would enable them to realize that they were members of a Royal Priesthood. And to this end, while he suspended his opinion on 'the legality,' he could not doubt 'the desirability' of admitting Readers to conduct services within the walls of churches." In other words, the multiplication of clergy, who shall minister by virtue of their Ordination, is not to be pressed, for fear of discouraging Christian Laymen from exercising their Royal Priesthood in the same indoor ministrations! Surely here is anti-sacerdotalism pushed to its furthest limits—not to add, quasi-sacerdotalism. It takes away our breath almost, in this jealous claim on behalf of the laity, to hear the unconscious echo of that ancient plea for encroaching on the most sacred functions—"Seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them."

A safer theology will render to all their dues; and while affording full and free scope to Lay Readers and other authorised Church-workers in their labours of love and out-door ministrations, will reserve the sacred precincts for the Deacons and Priests, as distinguished from all "*insacerati ministri*."

We cannot protest too earnestly against all confusions between the properly Lay and the properly Clerical functions in our Church. And this on two grounds: (1) Because never since the days of Origen, that eminently gifted Reader, has the Church countenanced any such claim of Laymen to preach and minister in the congregation, as would tend to confuse men's minds on the great principle of Holy Orders.¹ "We have no such custom, neither the Churches of God." And (2)

¹ Unless the Readers mentioned in the instructions of Archbishop Parker be an exception; the well-meant expedient of disturbed times when many parish churches would otherwise have been shut up, for lack of clergy.

Because the real Diaconate—that one only door through which the ranks of the clergy can be reinforced and the pressure of work inside our churches relieved—is embarrassed by this extravagant claim *for* the laity, while it is obscured in the eyes *of* the laity as the one true field in which they might aspire to exercise the higher spiritual ministrations. Not indeed but that the Lay Churchman's instinct is true and strong against treading upon holy ground; but the diversion of thought is unfortunately inopportune just now. Surely the advocates of the Diaconate, who have carefully piloted that Apostolic measure for so many years and through so many perils, have the most reason to be jealous. A counter wind is never more trying than when all hands are on deck in sight of harbour.

The Dean of Chester supported the resolution on the ground of ecclesiastical consistency. Its adoption would be a recurrence to the principles of the Primitive Church, and would tend to bind together clergy and laity, as also to drain Dissent of much that constituted its present strength. His sanguine belief that, if we returned to the principles of the Early Church, we might expect God's fullest blessing on our efforts, ought to be shared by all who apply the teaching of the Acts in simple faith to our modern times and necessities. "Would we strengthen our cords and lengthen our stakes, we must throw ourselves unreservedly on the lines laid down for the Church by the Holy Ghost." Such was in effect the utterance of a Colonial Bishop, who had himself worked with encouraging success the revived Diaconate.

Canon Jackson, who was called upon for the last word, anticipated the unanimous acceptance of the measure with a hearty expression of thankfulness that he had lived to see this issue of so many years of prayer; and with his own peculiar felicity in combining the practical with the spiritual, he observed that during the three years which had elapsed since he had been deputed by his Diocesan Conference¹ to bring the subject before Convocation, a million souls had been added to the population, and he should like to know whether there had been anything like an adequate increase in the number of the Clergy. In other words, while we have been arguing and hesitating, to the astonishment of the freer colonial mind, about this revival of the Diaconate, such has been the recent growth of our home population that we have needed about 150 fresh clergymen a year, *i.e.* about three a week, to cope with it (to

¹ This was in consequence of an able and convincing paper on the subject, read at the Ripon Conference at Leeds, 1880, by Rev. C. H. Sale, Vicar of Kirby-on-the-Moor, Boro'bridge.

say nothing of colossal arrears).¹ A large reinforcement indeed! We can only hope, with the Canon, that the need will be promptly reduced by a wisely chosen and able contingent of volunteers.

Convocation at least has now cleared itself from the charge of having kept a door locked which ought long ago to have been opened. For this important issue our Church has great reason to render thanks to her Supreme Head, who "keeps her by His perpetual mercy."

We would now draw some practical deductions.

I. *To the Bishops* the Church of England owes, a special vote of gratitude, for upon the Bishops (as the advocates of this plan have been fully aware) will devolve no slight anxiety, burden, and responsibility. Yet it is a burden which, if we refer to Apostolic precedent, no shoulders but theirs should or can bear. Into their ears the cry has long gone up, telling of neglected multitudes and overburdened clergy; and many of the latter at least are now rejoicing in this unexpectedly near prospect of relief. An Episcopal consensus was the first thing absolutely needed to make the scheme workable. For while it was taken up by one Bishop and ignored by his neighbour, the Deacon, accepted on the understanding that he should for some years at least go no higher, would sometimes be tempted to cross the border both of his diocese and his bond. The real problem, said the President at York, was to get the Bishops strictly to bind themselves not to ordain to the priesthood Deacons admitted by their right reverend brethren under special circumstances. We presume that this reciprocal engagement will now obtain on the Bench. Thus an exodus from one diocese into another will be prevented, such as hampered the experiment in the hands of Bishop Philpotts, thirty years ago. Not that we can for one moment admit the Archbishop's parenthesis, that the experiment at Exeter was "a complete failure." Individual failures there may have been among the Deacons ordained by that Bishop under pledge to remain such for a period of years. But the palmary example of the African Bishop, Edmund Steere—who but for the bold venture at Exeter would never have entered holy orders—must for ever redeem that "extension of the Diaconate" from the charge of failure.

In addition to the loyalty to the measure which the Bishop of Durham has so freely promised, and which we may predicate of all his right reverend brethren, the Church may fairly hope

¹ In Leeds alone, said Canon Jackson, there was one parish of 12,000, another of 8,000, and another of 6,000, the Incumbents of which were unable to obtain help from any society whatever.

that they will not be too rigorous in the requirement of Latin scholarship, knowledge of the Fathers, and minute theology from men of age and position, well-versed in Holy Scripture, and possessing undoubted spiritual gifts. A man's Latin may be rusty, while the power of teaching and preaching, due perhaps in some degree to that Latin grounding, may be still at its height. We gather from the wording of the Resolution that the stricter test both of theology and scholarship will now be, where it ought always to have been, at the entrance to the Priesthood. The Bishop of Durham's observation in his Charge, that he usually found men better prepared at the first than at the second examination, is in itself a striking proof of the abeyance and all but effacement of the true Diaconate. Their Deacon's year is so oppressed with duties properly belonging to the Priest's office, that they have no time for reading. This overpressure will be lightened by the multiplication of Deacons; for while some will remain in that Order all their lives, others will eventually, after four or more years, go on to the Priesthood, the first stile having been eased to them, and a longer space of preparation authorised before the second. But the preliminary *easing* is a *sine quâ non*, whatever the amount of extra caution in selection it may entail on recommending Vicar and ordaining Bishop. Men of age and social standing will shrink from the risk of being "plucked" on the ground possibly of imperfect acquaintance with Church History or the Fathers. The Latin test—necessarily imposed by Canon 34 in days when *conversing* in Latin (they must often have been the dog-days) was adopted during examination—will now become a slight, or an evanescent quantity for such candidates; while Canon 35, "on the Examination of Ministers," will amply cover the case of senior or professional men. Not but what there are numbers of these last whose knowledge of the Greek and even of the Hebrew Scriptures can compete with that of the most advanced candidates for Holy Orders. But the measure, to be thoroughly effective, must of course cover the widest possible field.

II. *The Clergy*.—This unanimous verdict of Convocation will be followed, we trust, in some instances by an authoritative request, by way of Bishops' Pastoral to the Clergy, to "look out men of honest report," who may be ordained to the Diaconate. In other cases there will be a tacit understanding that the way is open to the clergy thus to recommend candidates. It is of supreme importance that they should nominate, for their earliest experiment at least, only men of the first position in spiritual and social gifts. The Bishop of Durham's latest apprehension—the risk, namely, of the gratuitous volunteer lapsing into an acceptor of guineas, must be scrupulously

avoided. For though, as a general principle, the workman is worthy of his hire, here is a plain call to relieve the pressure on the Church by making the Gospel, so far as possible, without charge. And the men singled out as pioneers should be, at all events in the first stage of the experiment, raised alike above the practice and above the need of remuneration. Former failures, if indeed they can be substantiated, were in all probability due to incaution of this kind in the selection. In this new start the primary rule should be, "*Fiat experimentum de corpore non vili.*" "It is true," writes the Vicar of Ilkley, "that to the Diaconate only do we propose to admit men who have received a less elaborate classical and theological education than is expected from Presbyters. But we do not propose, at least at present, to admit men below the rank of the existing clergy. So far from lowering the prestige of the clergy, we would have it elevated by the elevation of the Diaconate to its true position in the Church."

III. *The Laity.*—Our chief appeal must be to the faithful laity, not to let this open door remain ineffectual for lack of applications. Some few, it may be feared, will be attracted by a prospect of being allowed in these days of latitude to minister as Laymen in the congregation. But the majority will have almost as great a reluctance to undertake such ministering as to be ministered to. Numbers of them are as fully convinced as any clergyman, who has learnt rightly to "magnify his office," that in this lies a sacred reality of commission, as distinct from a mere Episcopal License as the seal of the Ordaining Spirit is from every human charter. If their labours have been blessed already among the streets and lanes of the city, or in the wide outskirts of the large rural parish, *à fortiori* will they be blessed when the "gift is in them," and they minister side by side with the other clergy at the Lord's Table and in the congregation. If their Royal Priesthood, in virtue of their realized baptism, has been accepted, how much more, when they have been enabled "to make full proof of their ministry" in a sacred Order! Now, then, is their opportunity to prove the truth of their convictions, to their own blessing and that of the Church they love. Centuries have passed by since any field so rich as this has ever been opened to the faithful labourer of Christ. Centuries may roll on before any such opening occurs again, if the gate now just a-jar be not pushed wide against the accretions of disuse which still encumber it.

Misgivings will naturally arise—fears of unworthiness or unfitness—doubts of scholastic capability—a certain strangeness of feeling in modifying fixed secular habits and associations; but the Church looks to her Laymen for this sacrifice

of self to her highest needs; many a hard-worked Vicar's voice will be at their ear, "Come with us and do us good;" while above all the Master's voice will be heard (dare we doubt it?), "Who will go for us?" and for love of souls, and from a strong desire to put in the sickle to His harvest, the response will be ready, "Here am I; send me."

JACKSON MASON.



ART. V.—OUR SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

THE purest gold has its alloy, and the brightest light throws the deepest shadow. The same law attaches to our best and holiest works, and Sunday Schools are no exception to the rule.

Sunday Schools, with their 5,200,776 children and 593,427 teachers, in this country alone, exclusive of those which belong to Roman Catholic Schools, stand high among the most potent agencies for good in the whole Church. They give to those who occupy the higher grade of society an opportunity to consecrate their own better education, and a noble work to do for Christ, to the good of others, and no less to their own great benefit—for it is truly said that we know nothing as we ought to know it till we teach it, and the promise is sure, "he that watereth shall be watered also himself." They bring the rich and poor into a happy and intimate relationship, and they give a pleasant and easy access to the homes, and an influence over the hearts, of the whole working population of the country. And, more directly, they place the minds of children, at the time when they are most malleable, in a very attractive way, under the power of refinement, love, and truth.

Blessed and owned and honoured of God, however, as are our Sunday Schools, they bear the stamp of a fallen world, and they carry their own special dangers and abuses. But that would be no garden of the LORD into which no evil found an entrance, and therefore we may be glad, and accept it as a token for good, and thank God, that Sunday Schools are not free from attendant dangers. Nevertheless, the injurious consequences are real, and demand careful consideration.

The first evil to which Sunday Schools are subject lies in the question, Do they not practically supersede, or at least interfere with, the highest duty of the parents of the children whom we instruct? For what are the results? The parents are deprived of a very high motive to read and study the Bible themselves; and one very strong reason why they should

go to Church is also withdrawn, when others take their children there in their stead, and many a father would be much more likely to go to Church under the cover of taking his little child by the hand, and thereby escaping, to some extent at least, the ridicule of his companions. A check also is removed which leaves the day more free to the father or mother to spend it in doing nothing, or worse than nothing. And, in after life, the children can never associate, as they ought, their early religious impressions and their best memories with a father's knee or a mother's tenderness. And has not this sad loss much to do with that want of filial reverence which so characterizes the age? And, above all, it is to fathers and mothers, and not to Sunday Schools, that the Word of God says, "Bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the LORD."

It may be answered that the parents of our Sunday-school children have not themselves the knowledge or the ability to teach the Bible to their children. This would have been a truer objection a hundred years ago, when Sunday-schools began. We live in an age when knowledge and intelligence are very widely diffused, and most of the parents were themselves Sunday scholars, and had the same teaching which they are now called to impart to their children. And even if the parents have not the necessary knowledge, they might and would attain it, if they had only a sufficient motive, and no alternative. Doubtless the higher and better educated class of society has the greater knowledge, but does this single fact outweigh all the very grave considerations on the other side?

At least we are doing a very responsible thing when we take upon ourselves to sever in any degree, in a child's mind, his religion and his parents.

Are we, then, to close our Sunday Schools? No; by no means; as the case stands at present, the evil of such a course would greatly preponderate over the good. But we can be more discriminating in respect of the children we take into our Sunday Schools, and in every case we can do more to enlist the co-operation of parents, and to make the religious teaching a partnership between the school and the home.

Another difficulty which attaches to the whole subject of Sunday Schools is how far the teaching should be intellectual. And, as the religious element, especially in the Board Schools, is increasingly separated from the secular, the subject becomes more important and more involved, and the demand for the intellectual is increasing every day.

Let us consider, therefore, the more carefully how the case stands.

On the one hand, "knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth," and, therefore, if knowledge is separated from love, and espe-

cially from the holiest love, the evil preponderates over the good. The time of a Sunday-school lesson also is, and ought to be, short, and it scarcely affords space for any more than the simplest religious instruction. The teachers, too, as a general rule, have not been highly educated, and unhappily the least educated are usually the most ambitious to be, or to appear, intellectual. And, still more, if the Sunday-school be the substitute for home-teaching, it should be what a pious father's or mother's teaching would be to their child—simple, practical, loving, about every day's duties or temptations or pleasures; and the love of God, and Christ and His salvation, the sum and substance of it all.

On the other hand, we have the command, "With all thy getting get understanding, and wisdom and knowledge shall be the stability of thy times and strength of salvation." Also, true religion requires in some of its parts the highest exercise of intellect, and secular knowledge adds interest and animation even to the most spiritual subjects.

It is also of very urgent importance, in these sceptical days, that every young person should be able to meet the objections to revealed truth which they will hear on every side. And all these considerations demand intellectual teaching.

Perhaps we shall come to the right conclusion if we say, Let the teaching be intellectual, so far as the teacher is really competent to make it so, set to the meridian of the mind of the scholar, and introduced only in illustration of the higher subject which is under consideration—the spiritual being always the focus of the intellectual.

For instance, the power of all teaching depends very much on illustration, and especially to the little-educated and to children; and it is very desirable, therefore, that the teacher should be able to use and explain the analogies of nature and art which are used in the Bible, such as light, seed, water, pastoral life, agriculture, architecture, music, and such-like—all of which require thought and study. Some knowledge also of dates and contemporary history, and of the habits of the age, and geography, is very useful, and gives life to a lesson.

And even above and beyond this, the deepest and most cardinal subject, such as the proofs of inspiration and of the Deity of Christ, and the history, formation, and preservation of the Bible as a book, may be made very pleasant and useful even to a child, if only the teacher knows his subject well. But no teacher needs to fear that he will lose caste with his scholars if he says, in answer to any question which may be asked, "I do not know; I will consider and inquire, and tell you another time;" the class will appreciate his honest manliness, and only respect and love him the more.

There is also another grave difficulty respecting Sunday Schools—how far discipline should be carried, and in what way it should be exercised. Punishment of every kind is always alien to the spirit of a Sunday-school. Tickets, and good or bad marks, are, next to the teacher's moral influence, the best, and ought to be sufficient, means of securing order and good conduct. If more is wanted, it is best for the teacher to refer the whole matter at once to the clergyman or superintendent. The teacher should very seldom, if ever, punish; any punishment of shame is to be avoided, it soon hardens into nothing, or worse than nothing. A child should be always treated with respect. "*Magna debetur puero reverentia*" should be the motto of every schoolroom.

There is one conclusion to which these and many other important questions respecting Sunday-schools necessarily lead: the extreme importance, and almost necessity, of regular, not less than monthly, meetings of the clergyman and his teachers. At these meetings all such subjects can be discussed with the requisite knowledge of the particular circumstances and requirements of the case. It is not too much to say that without such meetings for prayer and consultation, no Sunday-school can maintain a high tone and efficiency, and no minister can really know, as he ought to know, or do his duty to, the younger members of his flock.

There are two points which both minister and teachers must never forget: One, that the end and aim and power of all Sunday teaching is not secular knowledge, but the increase of faith and obedience and love and piety; for, if the emblem is permissible, the week-day teaching is to fill the barn with wheat, and the Sunday School is to turn that wheat into bread,—and the other, that the Sunday School is the cradle of the parish, and the future of the Church.

The following books will be found very suggestive and helpful guides to Sunday-school teachers:

Eugene Stock's Lessons on the Life of our Lord and Acts of the Apostles.

The Cambridge Bible.

Edersheim on the Old Testament.

Lessons, by S. G. Stock.

Commentary, by the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge.

Teacher's Bible.

Teacher's Prayer-Book.

Prayer-Book Interleaved.

Norris on the Prayer-Book.

And just in proportion as a teacher is really able and competent and well-informed will be the measure of the previous study and prayer which he gives to his Sunday lesson.

JAMES VAUGHAN.

ART. VI.—THE CONVOCATIONS ON LAY READERS
AND THE DIACONATE.

THE need for an extension of the Ministry in the Church, beyond its present limits of supply must now be taken as indisputable. The Bishops of both Provinces have by resolution in Convocation described it as "overwhelming." Such an utterance on their part must be felt as decisive, when it is considered that this is a question in which their own peculiar responsibilities are primarily involved; that their survey of the field of action is at once more general and more detailed than that which other men are obliged to take; and lastly, that new movements in this direction involve debates and anxieties for them, which they would be thankful to avoid; so that, if they could see that things are fairly well, their natural bias would be to let well alone. It may be added, that the entire debates which have brought out these expressions and proceeded upon these convictions were highly honourable to the Bishops, as representing the frank admission of facts, the serious consideration of the times, the calm judgment in deliberation, and the paternal solicitude for the salvation of souls, which are proper to the stewards of God.

The attention of the Church has thus been called to the subject in the most satisfactory way; with the advantage of closing the preliminary question, and carrying us beyond the argument that "Something must be done," into the definite inquiry, "What shall it be?"

The Resolutions of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury have now been long enough before the Church to give time for reflection; and it is to be hoped that results of such reflection will be contributed from many quarters, so that probable consequences may be better foreseen, and final action determined. This is sufficient apology for the observations now to be offered.

The House approached the whole subject on the lines laid down by the Report of its Committee, which, treating the enlargement of the Diaconate, and the organization of Lay ministrations as alternative schemes, set aside the former, and confined its recommendations to the latter, as expressed in the Resolutions given below.¹

¹ "1. That no person be admitted to the office of Reader who has not been confirmed and is not a communicant in the Church of England, and that the Bishop should satisfy himself of his personal fitness, knowledge of Scripture, and soundness in the faith; that the Reader should also be required to sign a declaration expressive of his acceptance of the doctrines of the Church of England, and of obedience to the incumbent of the parish and to the properly constituted authorities.

Yet the Diaconate had its place in the debate, though not in the Resolutions, and the Bishop of Winchester expressed great regret that the subject had been "shelved." It occurred to him, however, that what had been put on a shelf might be taken off it, and he lost no time in proposing a Resolution in favour of an Extended Diaconate, which was carried unanimously, and has since been verbally adopted by the Convocation of York,¹ which afterwards added one on the other subject, declaring "that every encouragement and facility should be given to the spiritual ministrations of lay members of the Church, subject only to such restrictions as the laws of this Church and Realm impose." Thus a second advantage has been secured for our present consideration of the whole subject; since the effect of the Resolutions taken together is to present the two schemes, not in competition, but in combination, not for alternative choice, but for simultaneous adoption. There is obvious gain in this; first, because the desired object (extension of ministrations) will be more fully attained by two methods than by one; secondly, because the two methods are not really alternative for the Church as a whole, however they may be so for any particular parish; thirdly, because this combination has a modifying effect upon each of them, which each of them certainly needs. It is naturally to be expected that, if lay

"2. The Reader may expound the Holy Scriptures and give addresses, may read such parts of the Morning and Evening Prayer as may be read by a Layman, may conduct such other service as is approved by the Bishop in unconsecrated places, and generally act, under the incumbent, in visiting the sick, and in other duties. The Reader may, if thereto licensed by the Bishop, conduct in consecrated buildings, so far as not contrary to the laws of this Church and Realm, such services as shall be approved by the Bishop, not being the appointed services for the day, and may also publicly catechise.

"3. That the Lay Reader be admitted to his office by the delivery of a copy of the New Testament to him by the Bishop.

"4. That this House recommends that steps be taken in each Diocese to bring the subject of Lay Readers before the laity of the Church in such manner as may be approved by the Bishop."

¹ Resolution on the Diaconate—Canterbury and York: "That this House is of opinion that, in view of the overwhelming need of increase in the number of the ministry, and the impossibility of providing sufficient endowments for the purpose, it is expedient to ordain to the office of Deacon men possessing other means of living, who are willing to aid the clergy gratuitously, provided that they be tried and examined according to the Preface of the Ordinal, and in particular be found to possess a competent knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, of the Book of Common Prayer, and of theology in general; provided also that they be in no case admitted to the priesthood unless they can pass all the examinations which are required in the case of other candidates for that office; and that they shall have devoted their whole time to spiritual labour for not less than four years, unless they are graduates before they present themselves for their examinations."

ministration is the only form of extension, laymen will be pressed into work and offices which are the proper provinces of the clergy; and that, if an enlarged Diaconate is the only method, there will be a temptation to seek ordination for men to whom it would be better to assign temporary work as Lay Readers or Preachers. For these reasons it appears desirable that an extension of the ministrations of the Church should be upon both lines at once. But when the double basis is adopted, then the real questions arise; those, I mean, which affect the character of the ordained ministry, in respect both of its relative position and of its intrinsic quality. These questions will turn on the following points: (1) The limitations of Lay ministrations; (2) The conditions for admission to the Diaconate; (3) The protection to the character of the Presbyterate.

The extension of Lay ministration carries with it the question of its limitation, and here, at present, the only distinct subject of hesitation and debate is the proposal that "the Reader, if thereto licensed by the Bishop, may conduct in consecrated buildings, so far as is not contrary to the laws of this Church and Realm, such services as may be approved by the Bishop, not being the appointed services for the day, and may also publicly catechise." On this clause the Bishops were equally divided, and it was carried by the vote of the President, and it has no place in the Resolutions at York. The legal question I pass over. Opinion cannot settle that, except as opinion may procure modifications of law. Opinion is concerned, not with what is legal, but with what is desirable.

It is to be borne in mind that a building is consecrated, not simply for worship, or preaching, or the gathering of members of the Church, in whatever number, but for the (*λειτουργία*) public service of the Church as such in its constituted and corporate character. This is the character which differentiates the consecrated buildings from other places used for religious purposes. Is the present proposal an infringement of this character? Not necessarily; since constituted authority would be present in the Bishop's license and his sanction of the service used, and in the call and deputation of the man by the Presbyter in charge of the congregation. But it is precisely in this last particular that careful securities would be needed. The Presbyter is, according to the New Testament, president and ruler in the congregation; its bishop or overseer, pastor of the flock, steward in the household, to whom it appertains "to take care of the Church of God." He might reasonably, as such, call and depute other persons to fulfil, under his supervision, some ministrations in the congregation beyond what are now permitted. But if so, for the sake of the unity and

constitution of the Church, his relation to all that is done in it should always be made clear by his personal presidency or his express delegation of the duty.

We have, however, to consider what in fact may happen, and there is truth in the Archbishop of York's words, that though "he should like to see an enlargement of the power of preaching given, he thought there was a danger in this respect. At present they had to deal, not only with people conversant with ecclesiastical law, but with the general impressions that people of common sense would form; and the result of putting a very zealous Layman alongside of an average Curate would be to obliterate the respect that was at present felt for Holy Orders, partly, no doubt, on account of their exclusive nature; and by-and-by the congregation might begin to think that it did not matter whether a man were ordained or not." Forecasts also of other confusions consequent on the relaxation in question have been heard in Convocation, and others which have not been heard there will readily occur to those who know something of the varieties of feeling in congregations, and of the caprices of individual clergymen, and who have observed how little power supposed restrictions have against the frequent disposition when the inch is given to take the ell. This permission would be in fact a new departure, including some self-propelling power. Yet, if due securities can be found, it is capable of useful results, and in particular cases would provide valuable aid.

The Bishop of Lichfield feels about it so strongly that he has acted on his own conviction of the need, by giving these licenses in his Diocese, without inquiring as to the law, and means to continue to do so, whatever other Bishops may decide. The opportunities of judgment which he has may justify the action which he takes; but to obtain general acceptance for this permission, as a rule of the Church, requires a stronger case to be shown for it than has been yet presented.

This is the only definite point in regard to Lay ministrations on which difference of opinion has arisen. The encouragement of them has been the common aim in both Convocations, and the increase of them is certainly the best hope for the Church.

2. The extension of the Diaconate, as being part of the ordained ministry, affects the character of that ministry more nearly. It has been for some time largely and earnestly advocated, and it now comes before us with the concurrence of the Bishops of both provinces, though we can scarcely say recommendation, on the part of some of them. The Church will accept it in outline, and will be sensible of a certain gain, not only from the added number, but rather from the more

distinct character which the Order will thus receive; for the Diaconate, which has seemed half a fiction, will acquire greater definiteness and reality. But the whole effect will depend on the *measure* of extension and on the recognised *conditions of admission*. These questions are very loosely determined in the Resolution, and their safe settlement will require some of that knowledge of the world which makes men able to anticipate what will really happen. There would not be anything like the same cause for anxiety if the office were one which a man, when he had exercised it for a time, could properly lay aside. But whatever reasons might make that desirable, the history and habit and fixed ideas of the Church preclude it. The Deacon is "in Holy Orders," has received the character for life, and will still be distinguished by style and title as a member of the clerical body.

With regard to the measure of extension and conditions of admission very different ideas are broached. Some are of the widest character; and it is curious to hear them from so prudent a person as the Bishop of Winchester. "He had a strong feeling in favour of the higher grades of the clergy being educated gentlemen, yet he believed that the Church could not embrace the whole population in its arms, unless its ministry could be derived from various grades of society. His strong impression was that the ministry should be drawn, not only from the gentry and highly educated, but from other classes, as, for instance, farmers and the tradesman class; and he should not be at all sorry to see a certain number enlisted even from the class of operatives. They wanted to keep the upper grade of the clergy educated, refined, and intelligent; but there was no reason why they should not enlist into the lower grades of the clergy men who were not so refined and educated, but who might possibly afterwards attain to a fitness for the higher positions." The reason at present, which the Bishop cannot see, is that there are not these distinct grades among the clergy which is here supposed, and they must be created on purpose; and apparently the only way to do that is by the permanent Diaconate, which in fact his plan supposes. His last words, however, open a door of escape for some selected persons, to which, he may depend upon it, the crowd of their companions will quickly press. Perhaps we may come to this arrangement some day; but in "practical politics" the "permanent Diaconate" is set aside, and only the "extended Diaconate" is proposed, to which men may be admitted "who have other means of living, and are willing to aid the clergy gratuitously," with prospect of possible advance to the Priesthood on examination passed, after four years of such service. The first condition is vague; but since every man has *some* other

means of living, it may be construed as "independent means," or such as are derived from some kindred occupation—for instance, that of teaching. The second condition is insecure, since circumstances may soon make it desirable that the aid should not be altogether gratuitous. These conditions, however, can be reasonably interpreted, and the provision would, doubtless, in some localities bring in a certain amount of welcome and much-needed assistance for the services of the Church. But many of us will concur in the Bishop of Durham's anticipation, that such gains will be few on the whole, and will be far from meeting the need; and some cases will be unwise exchanges for lay-service rendered before with a power of example which will after ordination be no longer quite the same.

3. But in all changes that may be made, the subject of practical anxiety will be the maintenance of the standard of culture and attainment in the ordained ministry of the Church. While modifications of our system are taking shape, careful attention must be given to prevent the securities on this side from being impaired; for, indeed, they are none too strong at present.

The lowering of the average standard in the Diaconate must, of course, be accepted as a necessary part of the scheme. An infusion of men of a different educational training from that hitherto required must lower that average in proportion to their numbers, whatever compensating advantages they may bring. And when the inclusion of this element comes to be, not the occasional exception which it has been, but on the basis of a recognised plan, that involves the lowering not of the average approximation to the standard, but of the standard itself which is required. There is the alternative of continuing the present level of examination for the present class of deacons proceeding to the priesthood, with a lower level, or various lower levels, for others. But this would be found to create practical difficulties, and would be at variance with the desired object of giving to the Diaconate a more definite character and a more distinct place in our system. No! all deacons, *as* deacons, should stand on the same footing of admission, duties and rights, and in that case the present test of intellectual qualification will remain only in the examination for priests' orders. According to the resolutions the same test remains also for deacons of the other class, who may apply for such advancement after the four years' service. It seems to be thought that, in this way, the existing security will be adequately maintained. But let us consider what will actually happen. The ordinary candidate, who comes with his University degree, or Theological College certificate, or such qualifi-

cation as a literate as the Bishop allows, will find the first approach to the ministry made more easy by the lowering of the barriers which he has to pass. Much *preliminary* work which is now done will not be done then. Instead of being done in the time which is clear for study, it will be frequently adjourned to the time which will be occupied with practical duties; and instead of being done as a condition for the irrevocable step, it will be attempted by men who are already committed to the clerical life. Two consequences will follow. Where the test is insisted on, there will be more frequent rejections of candidates, and these under more painful circumstances. But often the test will itself give way before a natural consideration for the position in which the man will be left, the expectations with which he had entered the ministry, the good work which he has done, and his qualifications of other kinds outside the limit of the examination. The more we reduce the outwork which guards the approach, the less shall we be able to maintain a firm defence of the wall beyond. In the case of those who shall be admitted deacons under the new plan, the like considerations will work to the like result. Even men who became deacons as for permanence, will find that there are reasons important to themselves, and perhaps to the Church, for the advancing to the higher grade—and without great firmness in the Bishops the facilities of relaxation will rapidly increase. More weak and ill-prepared men than it was intended to receive will be ordained, in fact, and there will be a reduction of the educational level of the Presbyterate, as well as of the Diaconate.

Measures then must be devised to check this tendency and avert this result. No doubt the Bishops will know what to do, for it is plain that the present movement tends to create more embarrassing questions and more anxious responsibility for them, than, in the matter of ordination, they have ever had hitherto. Perhaps a remedy may be found in some system of examination outside that by their own chaplains (like the Cambridge Preliminary on a larger scale), which should have the power of giving men certificates as “Licentiates in Theology.” These might serve as ordinary conditions for the short Diaconate; they would secure to the men possessing them such stipends as are now given; and would give the Bishops more definite rules of action, and also greater freedom in regard to their own examinations.

The changes proposed in these Resolutions at present rise before us with a wavering and nebulous aspect. We shall see how much will disperse as vapour into space, how much will orb into the solid form of facts; while the latter transition is taking place, so far as it may do so, there will be need of

careful foresight on the points here mentioned, and, above all, upon the last. If we live in times which call for larger activities, and for larger numbers to carry them on, we certainly do not live in times in which the ordained ministry of the Church can safely lower its standard of intellectual cultivation. In these days of advancing and extending education, it would be simply disastrous to have in the front ranks of religion a line of official leaders, whose character for educated knowledge of their subject, and what belongs to their subject, had been depreciated in public esteem.

The suggestion now made as to the kind of provision which should be included in the movement to guard it from this attendant danger, is mainly intended to draw out like suggestions from other quarters; for the purpose of this paper has not been to discuss the movement, but to call attention to some considerations incidental to it. The movement itself, inaugurated by such authority, ought to be, and, I am persuaded, will be, welcomed as a fresh token of the grace of God that is among us; and it demands our prayers that it may be prospered by His blessing, guided by His counsel, and quickened in all its course by "the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ."

T. D. BERNARD.



ART. VII.—THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

WE have received the following letter—comments and personal recollections—from the Reverend Canon Hulbert, Vicar of Almondbury:

An article in the *Quarterly Review* for January last, bearing the above title, endeavours to apologize for the clergy in general, and depreciate the Evangelical revival, whether accomplished by the moderately Calvinistic or by the Arminian and Wesleyan party. The writer denies compulsion on the part of the Bishops, and ultimately traces the good old orthodox clergy from the Nonjuring as well as Hanoverian sections, down to the publication of the Oxford Tracts half a century ago. In this, however, the *Quarterly* writer does injustice to many of his favourites, who were earnestly opposed to "Roman Catholic Emancipation" (in which they foresaw much that has followed in England as well as Ireland), and would have shrunk with horror from the principle of Tract XC., in which culminated that series; which at first looked on with complacency by the heads of the Church, ultimately drew forth their censure, and obliged many to their only consistent course—submission to Rome.

I am old enough to remember the state of things some sixty or seventy years ago, and the traditions of the latter part of the eighteenth century.

There can be no doubt that, scattered over the land, were many worthy, quiet, orthodox clergy ; kind gentlemen, who kept up the Parochial system with moral propriety and true benevolence, but who looked with much suspicion on what is happily so prevalent now among many who, holding high views of the Sacraments and the authority of the Church, are supposed to be their lineal descendants—Evangelistic effort. But alas ! the present laws against pluralities and non-residence were then either non-existent or not enforced. That which caused the disaffection of a large portion of the people of Wales, was the non-residence and the alien language of the Bishops and clergy sent thither by the Georgian dynasty—owing, as the writer of the article correctly says, to the fact that the Welsh and many of the clergy were still attached to the Stuart family. The Welsh were either not ministered to “in the language understood of the people,” or they wandered to the chapels opened by the followers of Whitfield and others. Those parishes, whether in England or Wales, whose incumbents were non-resident, were ministered to in the scantiest manner by a class of hack parsons,¹ who served three or four (I have known even five) churches in a day, riding several miles between each.²

Of course only marriage or a funeral would lead them to the more distant parishes during the week. Pastoral visitation was out of the question. Some others of the clergy were Fellows of Colleges or Masters of schools, who gave dry discourses to gaping or snoring congregations ; except the service was rendered lively by a country choir : but sometimes the clerk alone gave out and sang the stave, or published a variety of notices of parish meetings and rates, and which roused the old farmers’ attention more than the text of the sermon.

Bishop Blomfield, when presiding over the Diocese of Chester, was one of the first to say to rectors and vicars, “*Reside or Resign.*” And I remember a curate who had about five changes of residence in fifteen years in consequence of this enforcement. But some cases baffled the efforts of the most earnest of the Episcopal Bench. In Shropshire, my native county, the Honourable and Reverend Francis Egerton—afterwards Earl of Bridgewater, and founder of the Bridgewater Treatises—held, in the first quarter of this century, the rich livings of Whitchurch and Middle (£1,258 and £1,003 at present). The latter was served by the above-named curate, at £75 per annum and the rectory house, for several years, until driven away by persecution on account of his Evangelical opinions. But the noble rector resided all the while in Paris, and his license of non-residence was signed over the heads of the Archbishop and Bishop by the sign-manual of the Prince Regent.

Of many incumbents the worldly character was too apparent. The surplice was often thrown over the red coat and top-boots for a funeral ; and the presence of clergymen and their families at races, balls, theatres, and other gaieties, was by no means singular.³ The “Book of Sports”

¹ The case is not even now extinct. When in North Wales, seven years ago, I took two English services for one of these overburdened labourers, who had two other Welsh ones to perform.

² See further Johnes’s “Causes of Dissent in Wales.”

³ In the Diary of the Rev. Robert Meeke, Incumbent of Slaithwaite, page 10 : “September 17th, 1689. Went to Huddersfield with the intent to get the Vicar’s hand to a certificate, and from thence to Honley to desire the same from the Vicar of Almondbury. There was a race there. I rode amongst the crowd looking for Mr. Philipson, but found him not. Afterwards I found him, and he granted my request. There was multitudes. O how fond is the generality of men to see such vanities ! more prone to meet on such occasions than for spiritual things.”

had taught, in Laudian times, these occupations even on the Sabbath—and they continued even under the Revolutionary and Georgian era. Down to a late period the name of Christ was very seldom found in their sermons, until the final ascription, nor the atonement dwelt on except on Good Friday, or other fasts or festivals.

The Presbyterian dissenting ministers in the early part of the last century, though moral and exemplary in their conduct, had become Arian or Socinian in doctrine. The works of Tillotson, once esteemed and still preserved in one of the chapels, are now under the Communion Table, the views of Priestley having superseded them.

When Wesley and Whitfield commenced their Evangelical labours, Dr. Doddridge was the only dissenting minister who gave them countenance. The writer in the *Quarterly* is right in attributing the early Methodist impressions to the school of Dr. Woodward, to Law's "Serious Call," and the other writers to whom he has referred. Even the Rev. Henry Venn traced his first impressions to Law. But the writer has omitted to refer to the expulsion of the Methodist young men at Oxford for preaching and praying. And the Reverend Benjamin Ingham, brother of the Countess of Huntingdon, one of the most earnest of the Oxford students and most successful of the Yorkshire Evangelicals, was forbidden by the Archbishop of York to preach in any church in his archdiocese. He preached in consequence in barns and other places. A sect called "Inghamites" arose in consequence, but is now, I believe, extinct. I rejoice to know, however, that some of Mr. Ingham's descendants are among the most generous and pious Churchmen in the county, foremost in every good work. I find also that Dr. Haweis "was oppressively driven from Oxford by the authority of Hume, Bishop of that Diocese, and was offered the curacy of Olney by Lord Dartmouth."¹

The clergy who were thus active differed in doctrine on election, but they were unanimous on the subject of justification by faith and the necessity of holiness. Hence the writer of the article in question is wrong in saying the "Evangelicals disparaged good works." He is entirely wrong. They renounced good works, indeed, as a ground of justification, but they used Scriptural language in regard to good works as the fruits of faith. Certainly there were some high Calvinists on the one hand who were Antinomian, and on the other Arminians who attributed election to foresight of obedience, and held the possibility of sinless perfection. Hence arose Fletcher's "Checks to Antinomianism," and his controversy with the Rev. Rowland Hill and Richard De Courcy. Such extremes are not yet extinct, either among Churchmen or Dissenters; but I trust they are few: and the works of benevolence, the religious and charitable Societies which arose at the conclusion of the last century and the beginning of the present, evidenced that the Example as well as the Work of Christ was upheld. One extreme leads to another, and I fear that in Oxford the Antinomian theory that personal parochial effort was needless, since "God's people would come to Him," as was said to me in 1829 by a young curate in Buckinghamshire representing an Oxford divine, may have tended to the opposite extreme, that out of the visible Catholic Church there is no salvation. But, at that time, certainly, true zeal and earnestness had begun to strike the old clergy, and Evangelical curates became in demand by those who felt the necessity of more animation. Some of the High Church clergy indeed began to say: "What do we? These men do great things; they are carrying off the people."

John Wesley and the Wesleyans are misrepresented with regard to their own conduct to the Reverend Henry Venn, the remarkable Vicar

¹ Memoirs of the Countess of Huntingdon.

of Huddersfield. On page 48 of the *Review*, it is stated that "Even in those parishes where it was acknowledged that the 'Gospel' was most fully preached, the Chapel was set up as a rival to the Church;" and it added in a note:

This was the case at Huddersfield, where Mr. Venn was "loved, esteemed, and constantly attended" by the Methodists.

The term "Methodists" was commonly applied to all shades of opinion in the Evangelical movement. The Wesleyans inherited it from the Woodwardian movement, and as late as 1811 the late Dr. Butler, Bishop of Lichfield, attributed to them high Calvinistic views, in his Installation Sermon at Cambridge. Mr. John Wesley himself said, "Good men in all ages have been what the foolish world call Methodists."

But the contrary was the case at Huddersfield to what is asserted. My parish of Almondbury overlooks that town, and is as Bethany to Jerusalem—a Sabbath day's journey therefrom; and I am assured by old Wesleyans that no such opposition existed. There was no "Chapel" at Huddersfield until after Mr. Venn left. In a pamphlet entitled "A History of Methodism in Almondbury," published in 1864, it is stated:

When Methodism started into being, Almondbury was not better than other places, nor yet so good as some. Here, as elsewhere, the tide of spiritual life was at its lowest ebb. Apathy and indifference had locked the energies of a nominal Church, and the ministry of the place was lamentably wanting in spiritual power. Huddersfield was at that time more highly favoured. There the ministry of the godly Mr. Venn was producing its gracious results. There also Mr. Wesley, on his visit to the neighbourhood, was permitted to occupy the church pulpit. Mr. Wesley, having full confidence in the efficacy and Evangelism of Mr. Venn's ministry, deemed it unadvisable *then* to establish Methodism in Huddersfield. Content to leave the town to its godly vicar. Mr. Wesley acted out his own principle of going only to those who needed him most. His helpers, inheriting his spirit and principle, followed his example, and, instead of coveting a position in the town, directed their attention to the more needy condition of Almondbury.

The then Vicar of Almondbury, the Reverend E. Rishton, was a very strict and no doubt orderly clergyman; but he objected to tracts circulated by the Rev. Samuel Furley, Curate of Slaithwaite, in Huddersfield; and Mr. Rishton wrote to complain to the then Archbishop of York,¹ who recommended him to counteract "these deceivers" by small tracts such as Archbishop Synge's "Knowledge of Religion."

There was no other place of worship, I believe, at Huddersfield but the Church until after Mr. Venn left for the Vicarage of Yelling, almost exhausted with labour poorly requited in a temporal point of view. When his successor, a man of an entirely different spirit, first drove into the town on a Wednesday evening, and heard the Church bells going for Evening Service; he said, "Stop those bells! I will have none of that Methodism." The consequence was that the congregation dispersed; going to churches four or five miles distant, where the Gospel was preached by the Rev. M. Powley at Slaithwaite, appointed by Mr. Venn; or his former curate, the Reverend Mr. Ryland, at Elland; or the Vicar of Kirkburton, of whom I do not know more.

At length a chapel was built, and the earnest followers of Mr. Venn, whether Calvinistic or Arminian, united; and Mr. Venn, perhaps unadvisedly, as I believe he afterwards thought, sanctioned the under-

¹ "Annals of the Church in Slaithwaite;" where for 200 years, with one exception, Evangelical Incumbents have resided. The exception was a Rev. Joseph Thornes, who was complained of to the Bishop by his churchwardens as a worldly man, in 1758.

taking ; which of course ended in a further schism ; and Wesleyans, as already in Almondbury, took a separate form at Huddersfield. And so, when a successor of Evangelical views came to the Vicarage, he found divisions and difficulties which seem to have suggested the better counsel : "Put thy trust in the Lord, and be doing good ; dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed."

One permanent memorial of Mr. Venn's zeal was the Elland Clerical Society, now 116 years old. Originally begun at Huddersfield for the purpose of clerical conference, but after for the assistance of pious young men to pass through the Universities of Cambridge or Oxford. After Mr. Venn's departure it was held at Elland, in the parish of Halifax, where Mr. Ryland was incumbent, and continued there for seventy years. It is now again held half yearly at Huddersfield. In Mr. Venn's time, several young men, who had been converted through his ministry, and anxious for usefulness, were educated by a pious dissenting minister, and became Dissenters almost from necessity.¹ This led to the Society, which has assisted many eminent men. The Rev. Samuel Marsden, the first missionary to Australia and New Zealand, was entirely educated and sent out, before the Church Missionary Society existed. He afterwards repaid the whole of his cost to the Society : as the pensioners are morally bound to do, if ever able, for the benefit of others.

What has been said respecting Mr. Wesley and the Wesleyans, I feel to be due to them. For although, after early acquaintance with the body, I have had the privilege of the counsel of Thomas Scott the Second as a pupil, Charles Simeon and Professors Lee and Scholefield as a student at Cambridge, and Daniel Wilson the Second as a curate at Islington, and maintain their moderate sentiments, which I had also traditionally received from Mr. De Courcy at Shrewsbury, I have always held friendly relations with the Wesleyans, whether at Slaithwaite or Almondbury, successively for forty-five years. Happily they are the only form of Dissent, if it may be so called, in this ancient village ; which for sixty years before had been favoured with resident Evangelical ministers, although for many years previously the vicars were non-resident. My predecessor, the Rev. Lewis Jones, forty-three years vicar, caused to be erected fourteen churches in distant parts of the ancient parish, where there were previously only two parochial chapels, besides the parish church, for thirteen populous townships. I have the pleasure of seeing Methodists frequently in the "Church of their Fathers," which is now free and unappropriated, towards the restoration of which several of them have liberally contributed.

Bradlaughism is our chief enemy ; and it is sad that one of his followers should be found on the Huddersfield School Board, and almost all religious instruction excluded : calling for strenuous exertion in the support of the Church Schools. It is not the fault of my parishioners, however, generally, but of the present race of Dissenters in Huddersfield itself ; the Wesleyans here having unsuccessfully appealed against it. I hope I may be pardoned these local particulars as illustrative of my general argument. We have also a surpliced choir, as is generally the case in the larger churches of this highly musical country ; and I have read with much pleasure the excellent article on Divine Worship, by the Rev. W. H. Aitken, in *THE CHURCHMAN* for this month. May we all unite in opposing the real enemies of the Church—Popery and Infidelity—by being firm on the doctrines and exemplary in the duties of our common Christianity as expounded in the Catechism, Articles and Homilies ; and

¹ See "Life of the Rev. J. Cockin"—a convert from Honley, cast out by his father for his religion, taken up by a follower of Mr. Venn.

leave no ground of offence in our use of the Book of Common Prayer, which is redolent with the Name of the One Mediator, by Whom we all can approach directly and personally, and yet in happy communion, to the Father.

Yours faithfully,
C. A. HULBERT.

Almondbury Vicarage, April 21, 1884.

P.S.—By your courtesy permitted a proof of my letter, I may add, as a reference has been made in it to Mr. Aitken, that in his Article in the May CHURCHMAN appear expressions with which I do not agree, though there is much useful suggestion.

May 14.

Reviews.

Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome. By R. F. LITTLEDALE, LL.D., D.C.L. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
The One Offering. By M. F. SADLER, Prebendary of Wells. London: Bell and Sons.

The Church Quarterly Review, No. 26. January, 1882.

The Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Eucharist: an Eirenicon. By the Rev. E. F. WILLIS. Parker and Co.

SO much for the matter of our controversy with Rome.

It must not, however, be supposed that, because we have insisted on keeping that controversy on its true lines, we are therefore altogether insensible to the unsound and dangerous tendencies of certain Sacrificial teachings which are not at all necessarily connected with the doctrine of the Mass, and which seem to have a certain fascination for many minds. We should be sorry to seem to be apologists for all that has been written by such men as Hickes and Johnson and Brett¹ in times past, and still less, perhaps, for much that finds currency among us in our own days.

Mr. Sadler has done good service for the Church of England in some able arguments against Romish doctrines in an article which appeared some years since in *The Church and the Age*.

Therefore we regret the more to find that, especially in his "One Offering," he has lent his name to certain teachings, or unhappy approximations to teachings, against which we feel bound to utter a few words

⁴ These men were unquestionably innovators in their teaching as to the Eucharistic Sacrifice. And that their doctrine had little support in the Liturgy of the Church of England was felt strongly by Brett, who declared, "The Church of England has wilfully and designedly omitted to make the oblation of the sacramental Body and Blood of Christ; and therefore, according to what Mr. Johnson says, she is without excuse in this matter. . . . If it be but a great defect, it ought to be corrected; and if it be an *essential* one, it is of *fatal consequence*. And *surely it is essential*, if it be what our Saviour did, and commanded us to do." (Brett's "Collection of Ancient Liturgies." Diss., pp. 219-221. Edit. 1838.) Hickes also attributes our forgetting the true doctrine of the Lord's Supper to "the alterations that were made in the office, or order of administering the Lord's Supper in the first Liturgy of the Church of England." (Treatises, vol. i. p. 126, A. C. L.)

of earnest warning. Let our cautions take the form of a few questions submitted to the careful and attentive consideration of those who would earnestly seek the truth in this matter of Eucharistic Sacrifice.

And the first question we will ask is this : Is the continual real sacrificial offering of Christ in heaven consistent with the teaching of Holy Scripture? We cannot but express surprise and regret that Mr. Sadler, while of course regarding the *sufferings* of Christ as past, uses language which conveys the impression of His *death* being, in some sort, a living, abiding, continuous thing. That the sacrifice of the death of Christ is in its effect a *juge sacrificium*¹ is what, we trust, none of us ever question. That our Lord Jesus Christ may be most truly said to appear now in the presence of God for us in virtue of that blood of the everlasting covenant, in which, or through which, He rose from the dead (Heb. xiii. 20) ; and that as our advocate and intercessor He may be most truly said to plead the merits of that blood for us, and, in some sense, to sprinkle with that blood of cleansing all our approaches to the throne of grace—all this, we trust, we shall not be supposed to doubt. But it seems clearly to be something much more than this, and something quite distinct from this, that Mr. Sadler contends for in such expressions as these, "The death of Christ, though it was actually endured in its pain and horror at one past moment in the world's history, is yet set forth in Scripture under images which seem to invest it with the attribute of eternity" (p. 79) ; "that Almighty pleading of His death which He Himself is carrying on now in heaven under a form which makes the very death present" (p. 81) ; and again, "If the death of the Jewish victim existed, and was included under the presentation of its blood, much more does the death of the All-atoning Victim exist in the presentation now going on on the throne of God" (p. 91) ; again, "His very death lives and pleads" (p. 44).²

Now the teaching which thus insists on the sacrificial death of Christ, as possessing in itself a mysterious continuity of being, has become very popular among us of late years. And it claims to rest on a scriptural

¹ "St. Paul says that Christ 'has offered one sacrifice for ever,' that is, one sacrifice available for ever—as the ancient expositors interpret the word. He does not say that He offered one perpetual sacrifice. A past act cannot be perpetual. But Christ HAS offered a sacrifice available in perpetuity." (Wordsworth on Heb. x. 12. The whole of this note is very valuable.)

² Dr. Pusey had said, "That sacrifice, once made, lives on in heaven." ("Eirenicon," p. 27.)

The late Bishop Philpotts, in a letter published by Archdeacon Freeman ("Rites and Ritual," p. 101), speaks of "the Lord's death" as "one continuous fact, which lasts and will last till He comes and lays down His Mediatorial Kingdom," and of the Eucharist as "A Sacrament of that continuous act of our Lord's suffering once for us on the Cross." Such language, if intelligible, appears to us to be astounding. To declare of a death once died [*ἀπέθανεν ἑάπαξ*, Rom. vi. 10] that it is lasting through time, is surely a contradiction in terms.

There is a very wide difference indeed between attributing to a sacrament the power to make an act which is finished in the past, in such sort continuous in the present and the future, that it must cease to belong in its perfection to the past alone—and regarding a sacrament as having for its divinely appointed office to be in such sort an effectual *ἀνάμνησις*, that we (in the language of ancient Liturgies) *μεμνημένοι . . . τοῦ σωτηρίου σταυροῦ* (see Neale's "Tetralogia," pp. 136, 137) may be (in the words of Bishop Andrewes) "carried back to Christ as He was at the very instant, and in the very act of His offering" ("Sermons," vol. ii. pp. 301, 302, A. C. L.), in the power of that faith to which *things past are present* ; as was well said by Rupertus Tuitiensis—"ut fidei, cui presentia sunt omnia praterita, ejus passio memoriter representetur." ("De Trin. In Gen.," lib. vi. cap. xxxii. Op. ed. Migne, tom. i. c. 431.)

foundation. It is ever ready to set before us the vision of St. John the Divine—the heavenly vision of “a Lamb as it had been slain,” and to plead the evidence of this vision as clearly attesting the abiding sacrificial condition of Christ in heaven. We are fully persuaded that this argument is an entire misconception of a divine symbolism—the symbolic representation of the truth conveyed in the words which were spoken to St. John in the heavenly vision, “I am He that liveth, and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore. Amen. And have the keys of death and of hell.” The Lamb is not seen on an altar, nor lying as slain. But It is standing in life—standing on a throne, with the marks and wounds that tell how once It had died. So It receives the tribute of praise, because “Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood.”¹ But let it suffice to appeal on this point to the Commentary of Bishop Wordsworth, to whom the Church of England owes a debt of gratitude for other similarly faithful testimonies to the same truth: “He is represented as having been slain, and as *standing* . . . as the ancient expositors rightly interpret the passage, ‘The Lamb *stands*.’ He does not *lie*, as a lamb which is *slain* does. He *stands*, because He is *risen*, and *dieth no more*. . . . This is also manifest from the use of the perfect tense here, ἐσφαγμένον, which declares that the Lamb *has been* once immolated . . . and that He is not now continually being sacrificed. . . . This is also further intimated by the conjunction ὥς, *as*. St. John does not say that he saw a Lamb *being sacrificed*, but that he saw a Lamb *standing*, as if it *had* been sacrificed, that is, bearing marks of its sacrificial immolation that was *past*; as Christ showed the prints of the nails, and the mark of the spear in His side to His disciples. Consequently, the song of the heavenly host is not, ‘Worthy is the Lamb that is *being slain*,’ but ‘Worthy is the Lamb that *hath been slain*,’ and ‘Worthy art Thou to receive the Book, for Thou *wast slain*, and didst redeem us by Thy blood.’ Therefore . . . it is allowed by the best Romish expositors that *this* passage, literally and grammatically interpreted, is not to be expounded in that sense [of a continual sacrifice] ‘although the Holy Spirit may seem here to allude to it.’ See A. Lapidé here.” (On Rev. v. 5, 6.)²

To suppose that an eternal Priesthood involves the idea of an eternal offering of an eternal sacrifice in a state of eternal death, is not only to do violence to our conceptions of the very meaning of death as once endured by the Saviour of the world; it is also to fall altogether short of the apprehension of the unique character of that Divine Priesthood, which, however it might be foreshadowed by a continuous teaching on earth of perpetual offerings and unceasing sacrifices, was itself to be a Priesthood of abiding mediation³ in virtue of one all-sufficient sacrifice, once only offered and accepted for the sins of the world. It is excellently said in our Homily “Of the Misery of Man” (a Homily attributed to the pen of Bishop Bonner⁴): “He is that high and everlasting Priest, which hath offered Himself once for all upon the altar of the Cross, and with that one oblation hath made perfect for evermore them that are sanctified.” (P. 22. Edit. Griffiths, Oxford, 1859.) How can any conception of a

¹ Bishop Wordsworth observes, “The original has the aorist ἐσφάγης—ἡγόρασας, Thou wast slain, and, by being slain, Thou *didst purchase* or *redeem* men by Thy blood; that is, Thou didst effect this blessed work at a *special time*, by a *special act*, namely, by Thy *death*, suffered *once* for all, on the Cross.” (On Rev. v. 9.)

² See also Vogan, “True Doctrine of Eucharist,” p. 467.

³ Bishop Hall says, “It doth not more belong to the priesthood of Christ, that He offered Himself once for us, a spotless sacrifice, upon the altar of the Cross, than that He daily offers to His Father the incense of our prayers, on the altar of heaven.” (Works, vol. ix. p. 67, edit. 1808.)

⁴ See Hook’s “Lives of Archbishops,” vol. ii. (new series) p. 212.

continuous death of Christ be made to harmonize with the Apostle's teaching, "In that He died He died unto sin once (ἐφάπαξ), but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God"? How can the idea of a sacrificial offering and death, continuously abiding in any sense as apart from His sufferings, stand beside the language which declares, "Nor yet that He should offer Himself often . . . for then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world"? How can any continuousness of strictly sacrificial offering at all consist with the declaration, "As it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment, so Christ was once offered (ἅπαξ προσενεχθείς) to bear the sins of many"?¹

No ingenuity of man can ever succeed in so evacuating the force of the Apostle's declaration, as to make it possible for this sacrifice to be afterwards really and sacrificially offered, either by iteration or by continuation.

Herbert Thorndike has well said that it (the act of sacrificing Christ) "can be no more repeated" (and we may add can be no more *continued*) "than the present time can become the present time another time."²

According to the teaching of Holy Scripture, Christ is now indeed a Priest, yea, a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec. But the word of the oath which declares His Eternal Priesthood follows close upon the word which says to Him, "Sit Thou on My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool." And now in heaven He sits—sits,

¹ As to the argument from the use of the word προσφέρει, in Heb. ix. 7, see Marriott's "Correspondence with Canon Carter," part i. letter i., and Vogan's "True Doctrine of Eucharist," p. 470. It is very observable how, in the application of the teaching of the type to the work of the Antitype, there is an entire omission of all language that has a sacrificial sound when reference is made to the work of the Great High Priest in the true Holy of Holies. Nowhere, we believe, either in the Epistle to the Hebrews or in any other writing of the New Testament, is the present work of Christ in heaven ever spoken of in words which can fairly be said at all to convey any idea of sacrificial offering. See Rom. viii. 34; Heb. ii. 18, iv. 14, vii. 25, viii. 1, ix. 24, x. 21. On 1 John ii. 2, see Bishop Wordsworth's Commentary. It is also observable how, with the idea of Christ's Priesthood before him, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews continually interchanges the term "Priest" with other terms, which would naturally lead our thoughts away from such a notion. See ii. 10, viii. 6, v. 9, vi. 19, vii. 22.

In Heb. viii. 3, our version "Wherefore it is of necessity" may mislead. "ὅθεν ἀναγκαῖον" (whence a necessity) might equally admit the sense (as rendered by the Syriac) "it was necessary." And the change of tense from the present to ὁ προσενέγκω can scarcely have been without design. See Marriott's "Correspondence with Canon Carter," part i. p. 5. See also Owen's Works, vol. xxiii. pp. 28, 29 (Edinburgh, 1862). To understand the sacred writer's words of a present sacrificial offering (unless of spiritual sacrifices, which are not here in view) seems impossible (though sound writers have sometimes maintained it). See vii. 27, and compare ix. 9 and 11, and especially x. 18 with xiii. 20. See also Morton "On Eucharist," p. 421.

As to the argument from ix. 23, κρείττοσι θυσίαις, it may suffice to answer in the words of Aquinas, "Id est meliori sanguine. Ob: Illa erat una hostia. Resp. . . . Pluribus hostiis veteris Legis figurabatur." So other Romish expositors. See Morton "On Eucharist," p. 414. Mr. Willis explains it as a Hebraism, "what is called in modern grammars, *pluralis excellentiæ* or *pluralis majestaticus*." Mr. Willis illustrates by several examples from the Hebrew, and adds, "I take it, then, that by a figure of speech familiar to himself and his hearers, the author speaks of the majestic Sacrifice of Christ in all its manifold aspects and efficacy, in the plural, though meaning the one true Sacrifice offered on the Cross, and perpetually pleaded in heaven." ("Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Eucharist," pp. 47, 48.)

² Works, vol. v. p. 547, A. C. L.

like Melchizedec, King as well as Priest. He is a Priest sitting on His throne¹ (Zech. vi. 13), not standing at His altar.

Then let us pass on to ask another question—Is this doctrine of a continual real sacrificial offering of Christ in heaven, supported by the teaching of Christian antiquity?

It is a wide subject, and one to which it is impossible to do justice in such an article as this. But we need feel no hesitation in declaring that the testimony of the Fathers is clearly and decidedly against it. In the midst of all their abounding sacrificial language there are voices which unmistakably utter the condemnation of such teaching.

Take for example St. Chrysostom, in whose writings sacrificial language is well-known to abound, and more than abound. In dealing with the subject of Christ's mediatorial work in heaven, his teaching may sometimes, indeed, be open to the charge of assigning too little to His offices above—of seeming to convey the idea of Christ's Priesthood ceasing with His session² at God's right hand. In this respect his language may be said to be incautious.³ But his very incaution serves to make it more abundantly evident how entirely alien from his thoughts and from his teaching is anything like the notion of His ever offering an eternal sacrifice of Himself—how completely his doctrine excludes anything like such a conception of a continual oblation of His death. It is no wonder that words so distinctly and directly to the purpose have been often quoted before. They may well be quoted again: *Μη τοίνυν αὐτὸν ἱερέα ἀκούσας, ἀεὶ ἱεράσθαι νόμιζε. ἅπαξ γὰρ ἱεράσατο, καὶ λοιπὸν ἐκάθισεν*⁴ These words are spoken with direct reference to the one perfect Sacrifice once offered, *τῆς θυσίας τὸ μεγαλύνον ἥ ἤρκεσε μία οὔσα, καὶ ἅπαξ προσενηχθεῖσα, τοσούτον ὅσον αἱ πᾶσαι οὐκ ἴσχυσαν*.⁵ Could words

¹ See Boulton's "Doctrine of the Lord's Supper," p. 11.

² As if the Priesthood must cease with the Sacrifice. So some Romanists have argued that the enduring of the Priesthood implies the continuance of the Mass Sacrifice. "But," says Brevint, "in the judgment of others, this proof is not only weak, but also false. For, says Vasques, 'Christ hath no need of this continuing Sacrifice; for He shall be Priest still, even after the end of the world, when there shall be no such Sacrifice.'" ("Depth and Mystery," p. 181.) Canon Carter has also argued, "If a Priest, He must, as St. Paul says, have something to offer." ("Correspondence with Marriott," p. 14.) To this Mr. Marriott has replied, "That this argument may have any force, you must assume that when St. Paul says a Priest 'must have somewhat to offer,' he means that none can be a Priest *unless he always, and at all times, have somewhat to offer*—that he ceases to be a Priest the moment he ceases to offer. But you have only to state this in words to see its absurdity." (P. 56.)

In the "Instruction in the Christian Faith according to the Orthodox Armenian Church of St. Gregory the Illuminator," there is the following question and answer—"Q. Did He indeed fulfil the office of Priest? A. Yes; because having offered Himself in Sacrifice, He was appointed Intercessor on our behalf, and Mediator of reconciliation with the Father." (Malan's Translation, p. 16.)

³ The correction of the misunderstanding to which it might lead will be found in Hom. xiv. p. 140.

⁴ In Ep. Heb., cap. vii., Hom. xiii. tom xii. p. 134. Edit. Montfaucon, 1735.

⁵ How strangely the language of St. Chrysostom contrasts with such language as the following: "This once entering in the holy place . . . there to exercise the functions of His Eternal High Priesthood . . . does not in any way mar the unity, or impair the perfection, of His Sacrifice on the Cross; on the contrary, it is *part* of that one Sacrifice, it is a *continuation* of that Sacrifice, it is one and the same with it. . . . Thus the Christian Sacrifice is at once permanent and single. . . . It is precisely in the *multiplicity* of the *oblation*, whereby the one ever-living Victim is offered, and the Sacrifice of the Cross constantly applied anew in its effects to the whole body and its individual members, that the perfection and indissoluble power of that Sacrifice reveals itself." (Willis's "Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Eucharist," pp. 30, 31, 2nd edit.)

express a stronger contradiction of an abiding offering of an abiding sacrifice?

Not less distinct (notwithstanding incautious expressions in Hom. xvii.) is the witness of the same writer to the truth that the sacrificial offering of Christ is to be identified with His sufferings on the Cross: *ἐπὶ ᾧ αὐτὸν, φησι, καὶ πολλὰς ἔδει θυσίας προσενεγκύν' πολλάκις ἔδει σταυρωθῆναι.* (In Ep. Heb., cap. ix., Hom. xvii. tom. xii. p. 165, edit. Montfaucon.)

And equally distinct is his recognition of the truth that the efficacy and sufficiency of the one Sacrifice in the past leaves no room for another (and by parity of reasoning we may surely add, for a continuation of the same) in the future. *Τὴν διαθήκην διὰ τῆς θυσίας ἔδωκεν. Εἰ τοίνυν ἀφήκε τὰς ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς μᾶς θυσίας, οὐκέτι χρεῖα δευτέρας. ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ.* (In Ep. Heb., cap. x., Hom. xviii. tom. xii. p. 175, edit. Montfaucon.) Again: *ὑπαξ' προσηνέχθη, καὶ εἰς τὸ αἰὶ ἦρκεσε.* (Ibid. Hom. xvii. p. 168).

Certainly in the mind of St. Chrysostom the real sacrificial offering of Christ was a thing of the past, and in nowise of the present. The idea of a continuous sacrificial offering of Himself as in a state of death in heaven must have been a thing altogether foreign to his conceptions.

We proceed then to ask—Is the perpetual real sacrificial offering of Christ *upon earth* consistent with the teaching of Holy Scripture?

The affirmative argument has commonly been made to rest very much on the analogy with that supposed continuous sacrificial offering of Christ in heaven. And so far, in the fall of that must this fall also.

But it is surely strange that the negative of this question has not been clearly seen to be contained in the statements, "By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 14), "Where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin" (x. 18).

Here is the assurance of the all-sufficiency not only of the one Sacrifice, but of the *one offering*, and a declaration of the consequent exclusion not only of any other sacrifice, but of any future (whether iterated or perpetual) offering of sacrifice for sin.¹

Is, then, this perpetual real sacrificial offering of Christ upon earth supported by the teaching of Christian antiquity? It must be acknowledged, indeed, that there is in the writings of the Fathers and in the ancient Liturgies much which at first sight, and to a superficial view, may seem to warrant this teaching.

But it will be found on examination that their language goes too far a great deal to be understood any otherwise than as the language of mystical representation. What is *passive*, indeed, in their sacrifice is real for the communion of the faithful in the Crucified Body and Blood of their

¹ "The force of our Apostle's inference, and the very pith of his discourse . . . doth more punctually refute the doctrine of the Romish Mass than it did the contradicting Jews." (Jackson's Works, vol. ix. p. 530.)

"The Apostle could not prove the legal sacrifices to have been imperfect for this reason, that they were often offered, unless this universal were true, and taken by him for granted, 'that no sacrifices or sacrifice, of what kind soever, which is often offered, can be perfect, or sufficient to take away sins.' . . . The very root and ground of this distinction [as to the manner of offering], if you examine it by our Apostle's argument, includes a confession or acknowledgment of the *crime* or *heresy* which we object unto them, to wit, that the bloody Sacrifice of the Son of God is not by their doctrine of infinite value, nor of force and virtue everlasting, but infinite only *secundum quid*; i.e., infinite in the nature of a bloody Sacrifice, not so simply infinite as to exclude all other sacrifice or offering for sin." (Ibid., pp. 584, 585.) "If . . . the value of the Sacrifice be truly infinite . . . the often offering of the Sacrifice, after what manner soever, is superfluous and blasphemous." (Ibid., p. 592.)

Lord; but what is *active*¹ is only mystical, figurative, and commemorative.

When we are with them in the mysteries we have before us not only the offering, but the Sacrifice; and not only the Sacrifice, but the very death of Christ, and in that death the very suffering and slaying and blood-shedding of the Lamb of God. The evidence of this is well-known and abundant. "*Passio Domini*," says Cyprian, "*est sacrificium quod offerimus*."² But the passion of Christ, as all acknowledge, can be in the Eucharist only by representation.

In their earnest desire to make the ordained memorial efficacious in calling up and making present to Faith's view the reality of the things represented—they revel in the use of language abounding in excess of sacrificial terms. Yet, when occasion requires an explanation they are not slow to make us understand that all is to be understood in propriety of speech, of what (except to the believer's faith) is absent, not what is present, or (in the language of our Homily) of a memory, not a sacrifice.

¹ It will be said, no doubt, that Waterland's distinction of sacrifices as *active* and *passive* is novel. The terms, indeed, are new; but those who have studied the language of the Fathers will not, we think, hastily say the same of the ideas they are intended to convey.

And if the distinction is real, it is important. Very much perplexity and confusion of thought appears to have arisen from this assumption—that, if in the Eucharist a Sacrifice is given to us for the food of our souls, then in the Eucharist that Sacrifice must first have been there to be offered. Whereas, in truth, the presence to faith of the Sacrifice for food implies the notion of a Sacrifice *only passively, not actively* considered.

Out of this assumption seem to have arisen the strange theories of Christ's sacrificing Himself in His Last Supper. Whereas, in truth, all the language of the institution of the Eucharist, which can be said to be really and clearly sacrificial, will be found to point to a Sacrifice *not actively but passively* considered.

"Our Lord's Sacrifice, *actively* considered," says Waterland, "as a proper act of sacrificing, was performed once for all, was one transient act; but the subject-matter of it, viz. Christ Himself, and the virtue of that Sacrifice, are *permanent* things, to be for ever commemorated, exhibited, participated. . . . Therefore Christ's Sacrifice is our Sacrifice, but in the *passive* sense, for us to partake of, not to give to God." (Works, vol. v. p. 235.)

Waterland quotes from the moderate Roman Catholic, Barnes: "*Capiendo sacrificium passive, pro sacrificio, noviter applicato nobis, asseritur rite sacrificium missæ*." (P. 236.)

² Quia passionis ejus mentionem in Sacrificiis omnibus facimus (passio est enim Domini Sacrificium quod offerimus) nihil aliud quam quod ille fecit facere debemus." (Cyprian, Epist. lxiii. Op. c. 231, edit. Baluzius, 1728.)

This, we believe, is the earliest use of such language as this. On this language see Waterland, Works, vol. iv. pp. 479, 480, 753, 758; vol. v. p. 129. Justin Martyr spoke of offering the bread whereby is commemorated the Passion (Trypho, c. 117), and of the bread which our Lord Jesus Christ commanded in remembrance of His Passion (*εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους οὗ ἔπαθεν*). (Trypho, c. 41.) The Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions prays for the sending of the Holy Spirit, *ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταυτην, σὺν μάρτυρα τῶν παθημάτων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ*. St. Cyril of Jerusalem said, *Χριστὸν ἐσφαγιασμένον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀμαρτημάτων προσφέρομεν*. (Mystag., v. § 10, p. Op. 328, edit. Bened.)

Undoubtedly, as Professor Ince observes, "Irenæus, and the Church of the first three centuries, held that the bread and wine in the Eucharist were offered to God in grateful memory of His gifts to man in the food of the earth, as well as also in commemoration of the Passion of the Redeemer, and in this sense called the still unconsecrated bread and wine a Sacrifice." (Second Letter to Bramley, p. 6.) See Heurtley's "Sermons on Recent Controversy," p. 56, and Blunt's "Early Fathers," pp. 446, 447. On the sense in which Cyprian and others use the word "offer," see Waterland, vol. v. pp. 269, 270.

So Eusebius Cæs. : *μνήμην ἡμῖν παραδούς, ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ διηρκῶς προσφέρειν.* ("Demon. Evang.," lib. i. cap. x. p. 38, edit. Paris, 1628.)

So Chrysostom : *προσφέρομεν μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμενοι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ· καὶ μία ἐστὶν ἄντη, καὶ οὐ πολλάι· πῶς μία, καὶ οὐ πολλάι· ἐπειδὴ ἅπαξ προσήρχθη . . . οὐκ ἄλλην θυσίαν, καθάπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τότε, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰεὶ ποιούμεν· μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.* (In Ep. Heb., cap. x., Hom. xvii. tom. xii. pp. 168-9, ed. Montfaucon, 1735.)

So Theodoret : *δῆλον τοῖς τὰ θεῖα πεπαιδευμένοις, ὥς οὐκ ἄλλην τινὰ θυσίαν προσφέρομεν, ἀλλὰ τῆς μᾶς ἐκείνης καὶ σωτηρίου τὴν μνήμην ἐπιτελοῦμεν.* (In Ep. Heb., cap. viii., tom. iii. p. 594, edit. Schulze.)

So Augustine : "*Hujus sacrificii caro et sanguis ante adventum Christi per victimas similitudinum promittebatur ; in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur ; post adscensum Christi per Sacramentum memorie celebratur.*" ("Contra Faustum," lib. xx. cap. xxi. Op. ed., Ben. 1688, tom. viii. c. 348.)

Surely these extracts may suffice to explain what needs to be explained in the incautious language of those who used freely sacrificial terms in speaking of the Eucharist, before the doctrine of a real sacrifice for sins there offered had come into being.

But now we must come to direct our attention more particularly to the teaching of the words used by our blessed Lord in institution of the Sacrament of His Supper. Is it, or is it not, rightly said that they contain the teaching of a continuation or renewal of the offering of the Sacrifice of Himself?

The argument from the saying *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*¹ has perhaps been sufficiently

¹ Mr. Willis, who argues strongly in favour of the sacrificial sense of *ποιεῖτε*, expresses himself as convinced (though he does not press it as an argument) that in 1 Tim. ii. 1 *ποιεῖσθαι . . . εὐχαριστίας* should be translated not "giving of thanks be made," but "Eucharists be offered on behalf of all men." And this would seem to be a very natural inference from his view. He says, "*Εὐχαριστία* had no doubt already, in St. Paul's time, become the recognised name for the Holy Communion." ("Sacrificial Aspect of Holy Eucharist," p. 26.) But if St. Paul had really meant to give directions for the offering of Eucharists for all men, we should certainly have expected that St. Chrysostom and Theodoret would so have understood his words. But what does St. Chrysostom say in his Exposition?—*δέσεις, φησί, προσευχάς, ἐντεύξεις, εὐχαριστίας· δεῖ γὰρ εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους γενομένων ἀγαθῶν . . . ὁρᾷς ὅτι οὐ μόνον διὰ τῆς εὐχῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἐνοὶ καὶ συγκολλᾷ ἡμᾶς . . . πάσα τοίνυν ἡμῖν εὐχὴ εὐχαριστίαν ἔχτω.* (In 1 Ep. Tim., cap. ii., Hom. vi., tom. xi. pp. 579, 580, edit. Montfaucon, 1734.) And Theodoret says, *Δέσεις μὲν ἔστιν, ὑπὲρ ἀπαλλαγῆς τινῶν λυπηρῶν ἱκετία προσφερομένη, προσευχὴ δὲ, αἰτήσις ἀγαθῶν. ἔντευξις δὲ, κατηγορία τῶν ἀδικούντων . . . ἡ δὲ γε εὐχαριστία ὑπὲρ τῶν προσηργμένων ἀγαθῶν προσφέρεται τῷ Θεῷ. ταῦτα δὲ ποιεῖν ὑπὲρ ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων παρεγγυᾷ, ἐπειδὴ καὶ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι.* (In Ep. 1 ad Tim., cap. ii. § 1. Op. edit. Schulze, tom. iii. pp. 646, 647.)

Theophylact says : *Σκόπει δὲ ὅπως καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰς ἄλλους γενομένων ἀγαθῶν εὐχαριστεῖν κελεύομεθα* (Com., p. 755, edit. 1636), and Eusebius : *δεῖ γὰρ εὐχαριστεῖν ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους γενομένων ἀγαθῶν* (Com., tom. ii. p. 218, edit. Paris, 1631).

It must be allowed, we think, that these extracts afford very strong evidence against the sense of *εὐχαριστίας* which Mr. Willis advocates so decidedly.

That *ποιεῖσθαι* here might have its meaning very well conveyed (as in the Syriac) by "be offered" is what, we suppose, few would care to deny. But for this purpose it obviously need not be used in a strictly sacrificial sense. And we think Luke v. 33 and Philip. i. 4 do not favour such a sense. If it is so used here, it is, we believe, the only example of such use to be found in the New Testament. The *ποιῶ τὸ πάσχα* of Matt. xxvi. 18 (which is parallel with τὸ πάσχα φάγω of Luke xxii. 11) cannot certainly be understood of *sacrificing* the

disposed of. Its Syriac rendering, "Do *thus*,"¹ ought to be taken as very good evidence indeed against its being understood in the first ages of Christianity as meaning "Sacrifice this."² That the expression was clearly so understood by St. Chrysostom will hardly be maintained much longer by those who have read Professor Ince's Letters to Mr. Bramley. The Professor says: "I have now carefully reconsidered the passages in which St. Chrysostom comments upon the words of the institution of the Eucharist, and see no reason, notwithstanding what you have advanced, to alter my original opinion; and I am certainly confirmed in adherence to that opinion, by being unable to find any reference in ancient or modern divines before the seventeenth century to St. Chrysostom, as an authority in favour of the sacrificial interpretation of the words"³ (p. 3). "I am concerned only with the primitive interpretation of the words of institution, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, and I have found no reason for questioning the position maintained alike by Jewel, the great Protestant champion of the Church of England, and by Estius, the eminent Roman Catholic commentator, that no ancient Father took ποιεῖτε to mean 'sacrifice,' or 'offer'⁴ . . . The sacrificial interpretation, so far as I can ascertain, is comparatively modern, first started by some obscure writers in the sixteenth century. . .

Passover. Compare Acts xviii. 21, τὴν ἑορτὴν . . . ποιῆσαι. And see Alford on Heb. xi. 28.

Dr. Daniel says: "Accipimus Græcorum ad Liturgiam commentarios, δέησεις, προσευχάς, ἐντεύξεις εὐχαριστίας, a Paulo Apostolo Timotheo commendatas quotidianam religionem in officiis suis ad Deum dirigi. Nam in Litania majori et minori fiunt δέησεις . . . προσευχαὶ sunt orationes secreto a sacerdotibus recitatae, εὐχαριστιαὶ sunt hymni in laudem Dei decantati." ("Codex Liturgicus," tom. iv. p. 406.)

¹ In the Peschito version of 1 Cor. xi. 34. A similar rendering is followed by various Syriac Liturgies. See Professor Ince's Second Letter to Bramley, pp. 9, 10.

No evidence has been brought forward, so far as we are aware, of the words having been rendered "offer this" or "sacrifice this" in any ancient Version, or in any ancient Liturgy.

² Dr. Malan assures us that the rendering in modern Greek is by a word which signifies "to do," and not "to offer." ("Two Holy Sacraments," p. 161.)

That ποιεῖν, in the language of the Septuagint as applied to a sacrificial object, has constantly a sacrificial sense is what no one disputes.

But is there any example of its having such a sense in such a phrase as ποιεῖν τοῦτο? In Exod. xxix. 38 the ταῦτα ἐστὶν ἃ ποιήσεις is followed by ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου.

³ We should be sorry to seem to do injustice to the arguments so ably adduced in Mr. Bramley's Second Letter, but they fail to produce anything like conviction that τοῦτο ποιεῖτε must have been understood in a sacrificial sense either by St. Chrysostom or earlier Christian writers.

⁴ Professor Ince, indeed, is willing to admit that Justin Martyr uses the terms ἄρον ποιεῖν, τὸ ποτήριον ποιεῖν in the sense of "to offer bread" and "to offer the cup." He says (Second Letter, p. 3): "Justin Martyr is, I think, the only early Greek writer whose words favour your interpretation; but I am by no means convinced that in these passages Justin is giving his exposition of the actual text, St. Luke xxii. 19; for in that text of the Gospel there is nothing whatever said of τὸ ποτήριον ποιεῖν." For ourselves, before allowing this concession of Professor Ince's, we think it material to inquire: (1) Does Justin Martyr elsewhere ever use ποιεῖν in this sense? (2) Does the language of the LXX. furnish a parallel to ποιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον in a sacrificial sense? (3) Was the language of Justin Martyr ever so interpreted before the translation in the "Library of the Fathers"? Certainly his words were not so understood by the learned Benedictine editor (see Præfatio, Part II. cap. x. p. xlii. sqq. Hag. Com. 1742) among Romanists, nor by the very learned Casaubon among Protestants. Casaubon

There is a vast consensus of divines, Roman and Protestant, against the sacrificial interpretation" (pp. 9, 10, 11).

AN ENGLISH PRESBYTER.

(To be continued.)

Memoirs of James Robert Hope-Scott, of Abbotsford, D.C.L., Q.C. By R. ORNSBY, M.A. In 2 vols. John Murray. 1884.

On one occasion, when the Tractarian or Romanizing movement was referred to in the House of Commons, a clever Nonconformist member, whom Mr. Gladstone invited to join his Government, spoke of perverts (if we remember rightly) as Peers, Parsons, and women. A peer who at the time was in the lobby, being told of this, said, with a smile, "Why didn't he take another P? He might have said, 'Peers, Parsons, and Pleadings.'" One of the pervert-"pleaders" to whom the noble lord referred was Mr. J. R. Hope, afterwards Mr. Hope-Scott, of Abbotsford, whose biography is now before us.

An interesting notice of this work, as was remarked in the last CHURCHMAN, appears in the *Quarterly Review*; but over what may be termed controversial matter, the writer, naturally enough, passes in silence. On the whole, however, he shows himself a very friendly reviewer; and if the article seem to strongly Protestant readers somewhat surprising, they may be reminded that at the outset it professes to treat "Mr. Hope-Scott's religious life with the studied impartiality of the merely ethical student."

James Robert Hope was born in 1812, the third son of General the Hon. Sir Alexander Hope, G.C.B. When ten years old, he went to the Keyper Grammar School of Houghton-le-Spring, near Durham. This school was founded in 1574 by Bernard Gilpin, "the Apostle of the North," and by John Heath of Keyper. Among the names of mark on the school books are Hugh Broughton, George Carleton (one of the four English divines who attended the Synod of Dort), and William Romaine. Mr. Hope left Eton¹ in 1828, and went into residence at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1829. He was surrounded at Oxford by friends, many of whom afterwards attained the highest distinctions in the State, such as, *e.g.*, James Ramsay (Marquis of Dalhousie), and James Bruce (Earl of Elgin). Of Mr. Gladstone, in later years an intimate friend, at that time he saw but little. Mr. Hope's many attractive qualities, we are told, naturally created even a greater impression at Christ Church than they had at Eton; and he entered on academic life with great satisfaction.

wrote: "Justinus in Dialogo cum Tryphone dixit ἄρον ποιῆν, panem facere vel conficere, hoc est, Christi exemplo εὐλογεῖν καὶ εὐχαριστεῖν, benedictione et gratiarum actione consecrare in sacramentum Corporis Christi. Alludit Justinus voce ποιεῖν ad vocem Christi apud Paulum, 1 Cor. xi. 24, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν." (Ad Bar. Ann. xvi. 33.) See Bishop Kaye's "Justin Martyr," p. 94, note. Mr. Scudamore supposes that other Greek Fathers wanted the key to the meaning of τοῦτο ποιεῖτε which Justin possessed. ("Notitia Eucharistica," p. 625, 2nd edit.) But it is scarcely conceivable that if these words, spoken on such an occasion, really possessed and conveyed, and were intended to convey, such an important sacrificial injunction, their meaning should so soon have been lost to the Church.

¹ The Rev. Edward Coleridge wrote, in 1873, to Miss Hope-Scott: "While at Eton he became intimate with my accomplished brother-in-law, the present Bishop of Chichester (the Right Rev. Dr. Durnford), then a private tutor there." In the same letter, referring to Hope-Scott's later years, Mr. Coleridge wrote: "... to my unspeakable sorrow he left our communion, constrained, as he himself assured me, by the example of that glorious man, J. H. N., to whom he was almost spellbound."

His health, however, was not robust; he sometimes was depressed; he suffered from a sort of lassitude, and did not read for honours. But some of his friends, had interest; and in April, 1833, he was elected to a "close" Fellowship of Merton.

The ensuing three years of Mr. Hope's life, writes Professor Ornsby, "form a period full of uncertainty and wavering as to his future career, anxiety as to his religious state, and deep suffering from the sickness or deaths of relatives whom he dearly cherished." "The basis" of his religious education, says the Professor, was Presbyterian; but his father "much preferred the Book of Common Prayer to extempore devotions," and "had a great horror of Calvinist doctrine." When in England Sir Alexander attended "the ministrations of the Anglican Church;" and if, "out of the numerous shades of opinion there are now to be found in the Anglican Church," says the Roman Catholic Professor, "*the so-called Evangelical was the one which chiefly fell across his path, it was one from which he entirely dissented.*" The italics are our own. We lay some stress upon the words, for this reason. The *Quarterly Review* observes that in early life James Hope "had been brought up among Evangelicals." There is no warrant for this statement in this biography;¹ and the inquiry which we have been able to make leads us to conclude that the *Quarterly* writer is mistaken. One who knew Hope well assures us that he was *not* brought up in a Low Church atmosphere. His father was a High-Churchman of the old fashion or type, who used to read Mant's Bible in his family. His sister, too, had an early prepossession against the Evangelical school. When Hope was a young man, we are informed, he made the following observation upon the effort of a friend who was sending Bibles in boxes to the Colonies: "Do you think *that* is the way to make people Christians? they must be taught by the Church!" Such an observation is not the natural growth of a "Low" ecclesiastical temperature.

The "Tracts of the Times," it will be remembered, commenced in 1833. The "Anglican" Fellow of Merton was carried into the very thick of the Tractarian ideas. In a year or so he became troubled about "the question of forgiveness of post-baptismal sin." (Dr. Pusey's well-known treatise was published in the "Tracts of the Times," in 1835.) But after a time his peace of mind was restored. Accusing himself of having given way to a sort of moodiness, he set himself to settle in real earnest his walk in life. Should he go to the Bar, or seek Holy Orders? "A great disappointment," it seems, "led to his giving up all idea of adopting the clerical life." His "religious feelings," however, "had deepened." In 1835 he wrote to his sister, Lady Henry Kerr, "I am idle, very idle;" but the "more healthful tone of his mind" was gaining the victory, and in 1836 he wrote, "My law goes on amazingly well." Yet, after this, he felt discouraged; he was sometimes depressed. He worked, however, and his religious life was one of strictness; his gifts and acts of kindness were great. In 1837 he had formed habits in keeping with those of the more advanced of the Tractarian party. In a conversation with Mr. Gladstone the year before, he had said that, in his opinion, "the Oxford authors were right." And from this time forwards his views ran more and more strongly in a Romeward direction. In January, 1838, he was called to the Bar, and in 1840 his speech before the House of Lords

¹ It is true that Mr. Gladstone, in a letter to Miss Hope-Scott, dated September, 1873, printed at the end of Vol. II., says that though he cannot say why he *believes* that James Hope (as he was himself) "was brought up in what may be termed an atmosphere of Low Church;" but the right hon. gentleman was evidently not clear about it. It is an entire mistake.

was the foundation of signal success. In 1843 he began his remarkable career as a Parliamentary barrister; and in 1846 his income was "enormous."

In the year 1838 Mr. Hope became connected with the S.P.G., which he desired to regard as a Committee of the Church of England for Missionary work; the S.P.G., he thought, should *absorb* the C.M.S.! He was one of the prime movers in founding Trinity College, Glenalmond. Of his "proposed reform of Merton," an interesting sketch is given. Mr. Hope's turn of thought, as an Oxford acquaintance of his tells us, was antiquarian; and the rigid rules of the mediæval system, with their keynote "THE CHURCH," formed a most congenial study. He visited the tomb of Walter de Merton. Of his most intimate friends, even then, some were Romanists. He read and criticized the MSS., and corrected the proofs of Mr. Gladstone's "Church and State." In 1840, in the *British Critic*, appeared his article on College Statutes; and one sentence in this article gives, we think, the clue to his career as a strong Tractarian and then an unquestioning Romanist. He points out Waynflete's "two principal instruments for the Church's good—the maintenance of continual liturgies, and the formation of a learned, frugal, obedient clergy" (*obedient*); and then he asks whether in the present Church of England there is amongst the clergy a general sense that they are enrolled "*into a company where but one will should prevail*"—(ONE WILL).

Of his tour in Germany and Italy, in 1840, writes Professor Ornsby, a chief object was to study "the organization of the Catholic Church:?" *organization*, apparently, fascinated him. Before he set out he was installed as Chancellor of Salisbury; he occupied his own stall in a surplice and hood, being preceded to it by two vergers.¹ His B.C.L. gown seemed to some persons the right dress; but "he was positive for the surplice," feeling that he was "full an ecclesiastical person" as the singing men. He was evidently much pleased with his stall and surplice; yet he was hardly satisfied, for he says: "All the confusion arises from *the disuse of the tonsure and the minor orders*." The italics, of course, are our own. Of the "minor orders" Mr. Hope makes mention more than once, and suggested that the Episcopal Church in Scotland should make a beginning in that direction. Dr. Pusey writes to him, "I am very glad that you are seeing so much of the R. C.'s."¹ In writing to Mr. Gladstone, from Milan, Mr. Hope praises the Jesuits: "*What a noble theory theirs is!*" We have here so to say, an echo of his—Only "*one will should prevail*." He admitted to the "Father-General" that he had been born in prejudice against the Society, but he added, he "was ready to shake it off"! The Jesuits, no doubt, made sure of his obedience; but the time was not yet come. The Father-General, too astute to be led into discussion, said that "argument was not the thing." Mr. Hope admitted that prayer was best. The visit to Rome, "on the whole," "disappointed him." The Romanist Professor admits this; and the letters prove it.² Mr. Hope himself wrote: "The ceremonies which I have seen as yet move me

¹ A little later Dr. Pusey wrote about Tract XC.; he feared that many would blame them for "Jesuitism," but on the whole, "a great deal" of good would be done. N. was coming out wonderfully; and his "touching simplicity and humility" [!!] would win many.

² In a letter from Lord Blachford (then Mr. Rogers) to Mr. E. S. Hope, in 1873, we read: He (*i.e.*, Mr. Hope-Scott) was not "much affected by the external magnificence of the Roman Church, but rather the contrary." But what did affect him "was the coherent system of organization of Rome," etc. It is the "*only one will*" over again.

very little, and I am more struck with the Romanism than the Catholicity of the system." The ecclesiastical "exterior," he adds, "is most repulsive." Nay, he was "half angry with Rome for looking so very like what Protestants describe it to be"!

In 1841, the project for establishing an Anglo-Prussian Bishopric at Jerusalem gave, says his Roman Catholic biographer, "the first serious shock to Mr. Hope's confidence in the Anglican Church." He did not think the Church of England should be termed "Protestant," but the Archbishop of Canterbury maintained the use of that word as applicable to our Reformed Church. Charges hostile to Tract XC, disturbed Mr. Hope; and he asked Mr. Newman what "Catholics" (he means, of course, Tractarians) ought to do; the answer being that "till truth is silenced," "Catholics" should only "contemplate the possibility" of leaving a Protestant Church, a Church, we must add, which is truly "Catholic" as well as Protestant. It is of organization, and of obedience to one man's will, rather than of truth and liberty as set forth in the Word of God, of the Church rather than of Christ, that these Tractarians were thinking. Mr. Newman's letter, towards the close of Vol. I., and his protest, will be read, we think, with something more than surprise by even High Churchmen who have not, as yet, studied the Tractarian literature of 1841-42.

We have now reached, in a brief summary of Mr. Hope's career, the end of Volume I. In the second Volume there are many matters, *e.g.*, some expressions in Mr. Gladstone's letters, on which we might well touch. But our space is limited. Mr. Hope married, as is well-known, Miss Lockhart, daughter of John Gibson Lockhart, and grand-daughter of Sir Walter Scott. Three years after his marriage he went over; his wife followed, to the deep and lasting regret of her father. Mr. Hope-Scott's second wife was Lady Victoria Howard. He was, of course, a thorough Vaticanist. A single step after the type of Montalembert he never took.

The work has an interest of its own, for it shows the attractions which the Church of Rome possesses for a certain class of minds, and it illustrates the consummate cleverness of the leaders of that organization in which Christian liberty, as commended in the New Testament, is—whether for the clergy or the laity—an absolute impossibility. Again, it shows how essentially Roman the Oxford movement really was. The biography is written, it must be remembered, by an earnest member of the Church of Rome. But its testimony, in this respect, is full enough and true. It is a melancholy book.

Short Notices.

Modern Criticism and Clement's Epistles to Virgins (first printed 1752), or Their Greek Version newly discovered in Antiochus Palæstinensis. By J. M. COTTERILL, author of *Peregrinus Proteus*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1884. Pp. 127.

We must confess, at the outset, that we have not seen "*Peregrinus Proteus*," and so far are at a disadvantage in noticing the present volume, which contains references to the earlier work. But the treatise before us is sufficiently intelligible in itself. It is, to a considerable extent, an attack, often not very pleasing in tone, upon Dr. Lightfoot's edition of "*The*

Epistles of Clement." The pamphlet is a denunciation of modern criticism as represented by the Bishop of Durham; and the writings specially selected for animadversion are the edition of the Clementine Epistles and the articles on "Supernatural Religion" in the *Contemporary Review*. In his Introduction to the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, Dr. Lightfoot cites the Epistles to Virgins as being certainly not by Clement of Rome, but as being by a writer of the second century who was acquainted with the extant Epistle to the Corinthians. This false Clement is therefore a witness to the antiquity of the Epistle to the Corinthians. Mr. Cotterill claims to have demonstrated in this treatise that this supposed early witness is a very late one: that, instead of being a writer of the second century, the author of the Epistles to Virgins must at least be as late as the seventh. "The conclusion that these Epistles belong to the seventh century, at the earliest, is a sound one, and cannot be upset. We prefer to leave the question in this condition. The Epistles to Virgins are absolutely without value . . . They will not be quoted any more in illustration of the manners and customs of the primitive Church. They will not again be used to support the Canon of the New Testament." (p. 93).

The way in which the result is obtained is in the main by placing side by side passages from these Epistles and passages from the Homilies of Antiochus Palæstinensis, a voluminous writer of the seventh century, a monk of St. Saba near Jerusalem, who witnessed the capture of the holy city by Chosroes, A.D. 614. This comparison shows an amount of close similarity which cannot possibly be accidental. Either one copied from the other, or both copied from a third. No author from whom they could have copied being known, we fall back on the other hypothesis. It remains to discover which copied from which. "Everywhere the same phenomena are found, and it is manifest that the writer of the Epistles has filled out the language of the Homilies to suit his own purposes, and to give them that special tone which has seemed so ancient to editors and critics. It will not be forgotten that Antiochus borrowed from the same pages of Jerome as our writer, and independently of him, nor that the three versions of Ep. ii. on comparison suggest that Jerome's was the earliest, Antiochus's next in order, and our writer's third. We conclude, therefore, that the Epistles to Virgins were written after the Homilies" (p. 53).

Thus one of the witnesses to the antiquity and authenticity of Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians disappears. And readers of Mr. Cotterill's "Peregrinus Proteus" are aware that he disputes the authenticity of that Epistle. The position is repeated in the present tract. Mr. Cotterill contends that the writer of the Epistle to the Corinthians borrowed from the "Florilegium" of Stobæus as well as from Clement of Alexandria. If that be so, the writer cannot, of course, be Clement of Rome. But we are promised a separate treatise on this point, and may suspend our judgment until we have the whole case before us. Yet, many a student who accepts with a light heart the condemnation of the Epistles to Virgins, will feel a pang if what has hitherto been believed to be the earliest Christian document outside the New Testament, turns out to be a production of the third century. In the meantime, while thanking Mr. Cotterill for his immense industry, ingenuity and perseverance, we cannot but think that a little less arrogance of tone would make his writing neither less interesting nor less valuable. Nothing is gained in the long-run by speaking contemptuously of great men who may chance to have been caught tripping.

D.D.

Christianus, a Story of Antioch; and other Poems. By H. C. G. MOULE, M.A., Principal of Ridley Hall, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co.

This is a pleasing little volume, full of sweet and soothing strains. Mr. Moule, Principal of Ridley (worthy son of an honoured father!) is known as a scholar and theologian; many have read his Poems; and others will make acquaintance with him through this book as a writer of tender and thoughtful verse. "Christianus," a story of Antioch in the reign of Domitian, is very suggestive; the aged Christian says:

Not Zeno's goal of hope incites me now,
Nor Plato's, nor the doleful glooms I dread
Of Homer's Underworld, existence mere
Without emotion, everlasting cloud.
My Paradise is Christ.

A passage from some of the occasional pieces may here be quoted. The poem entitled "God's Acre" opens thus:

Come, let us pace the churchyard walks awhile,
The Day behind us in the solemn West
Goes glowing down, and on this ancient field,
Where fifty generations sleep entomb'd,
Throws many a purple shadow; tower and aisle
And trees and thronging head-stones o'er the green
Stretching long lines. Before us, smooth and pale,
The meadow-plains with many a shining stream
Lead eastward from the mill-pool at our feet,
To yon calm azure cloud of distant hills.
Fair English scene! but more to me than fair,
Each grove or bounding hedgerow, every glance
Of bright meanders through their rushy fringe
Answers my gaze as with the conscious smile
Of some known countenance dear. From dawn to noon
Of Life's long hours has that well-water'd vale,
Unaltered and unalterable still,
Greeted these eyes; the landscape of my birth.

Here is a modern George Herbert verse on *Heaven and Home*

What joys are lost, what hopes are given,
As through this death-struck world we roam!
We think awhile that Home is Heaven:
We learn at last that Heaven is Home.

The Gospel according to St. Mark, with Introduction, Notes, and Maps. By THOMAS M. LINDSAY, D.D., Professor of Divinity, Free Church College, Glasgow. Pp. 250. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

This is a volume of Messrs. Clark's useful series, "Handbooks for Bible Classes, and for Students." Dr. Lindsay's notes are, as a rule, judicious, terse, and suggestive. But the note on xvi. 9-20 had been better, we think, if he had read Dean Burgon's masterly book. The Dean's argument, published some twelve years ago, has never been answered. What is the evidence? The last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel are attested by every one of the Versions, by every known Manuscript (except \aleph and B), by a mighty chorus of Fathers, and by the Tradition of the Church. This matter is of importance, and as, in the book before us, intended for Bible-classes, Jerome is quoted as against verses 9-20, we make no apology for quoting here the passage from the recent work of Dean Burgon, which shows the real state of the case:

"We naturally cast about," writes the Dean, "for some evidence that 'the members of the New Testament Company possess that mastery of

"the subject which alone could justify one of their number (Dr. Milligan) in asserting roundly that these twelve verses are '*not from the pen of St. Mark himself*,'¹ and another (Dr. Roberts) in maintaining that 'the passage is *not the immediate production of St. Mark*.'² Dr. Roberts assures us that :

"Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, Victor of Antioch, Severus of Antioch, Jerome, as well as other writers, especially Greeks, testify that these verses were not written by St. Mark, or not found in the best copies."³

"Will the learned writer permit us to assure him in return that he is entirely mistaken? He is requested to believe that Gregory of Nyssa says nothing of the sort—*says nothing at all* concerning these verses; that Victor of Antioch vouches emphatically for their *genuineness*: that Severus does but copy, while Jerome does but translate, a few random expressions of Eusebius; and that Eusebius himself *nowhere* 'testifies that these verses were not written by St. Mark.' So far from it, Eusebius actually *quotes the verses*, quotes them as *genuine*. Dr. Roberts is further assured that there are *no* 'other writers,' whether Greek or Latin, who insinuate doubt concerning these verses. On the contrary, besides *both* the Latin, and *all the* Syriac—besides the Gothic and the *two* Egyptian versions—there exist four authorities of the second century, as many of the third, five of the fifth, four of the sixth, as many of the seventh—together with *at least ten* of the fourth⁴ (*con-temporaries therefore of codices B and N*), which actually *recognise the verses in question*. Now, when to *every known Manuscript but two* of bad character—besides *every ancient Version*--some *one-and-thirty Fathers* have been added, eighteen of whom must have used copies at least as old as either B or N—Dr. Roberts is assured that an amount of external authority has been accumulated which is simply impregnable in discussions of this nature. But the significance of a single feature of the Lectionary, of which up to this point nothing has been said, is alone sufficient to determine the controversy. We refer to the fact that *in every part of Eastern Christendom* these same twelve verses—neither more nor less—have been from the earliest recorded period, and still *are, a proper lesson both for the Easter season and for Ascension Day.*'—("Revision Revised," p. 40.)

Perfecting Holiness. By the Rev. E. L. CUTTS, B.A., D.D. Author of "Pastoral Counsels," etc. Pp. 90. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

This is an eminently suggestive and practical work. Dr. Cutts writes on self-knowledge, thoughts, imagination, habit, self-control, and so forth, and in every subject he writes to the point. Two or three passages are rather dry; but for self-examination in earnest, and thorough searching of heart, most readers perhaps will find the book really helpful. We agree with a remark in the introduction on two great faults of the preaching of the present day: first, there is not enough systematic elementary teaching in it; and second, it deals too exclusively with the science of theology, and too little with the art of holy living. A "rousing" sermon of thirty minutes, earnest and orthodox, may teach almost nothing about

¹ "Words of the New Testament," p. 193.

² "Companion to the Revised Version," p. 63.

³ Ibid. p. 62.

⁴ Viz. Eusebius, Macarius Magnes, Aphraates, Didymus, the Syriac "Acts of the App.," Epiphanius, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine. It happens that the disputation of Macarius Magnes (A.D. 300-350) with a heathen philosopher, which has recently come to light, contains an elaborate discussion of St. Mark xvi. 17, 18. Add the curious story related by the author of the "Pascal Chronicle" (A.D. 628), hitherto overlooked.

a "godly, righteous, and sober life;" and as to the too common cast of fifteen minutes essay-sermons, vague and vapid, with scarcely a reference to the Holy Ghost, what can be expected from them? Even among those who have written recently of the higher spiritual life, there is not always a carefulness to bring out the true teaching of Scripture; such passages, *e.g.*, as "*follow* (a strong word) holiness" (sanctification), Heb. xii. 14, seem sometimes to be set aside. But for believers in general, no doubt, the great need is to examine habits and tempers, as to home life, business, recreation, etc. Religious feeling, whether in members of a "High" or a "Low" Church congregation, is oftentimes mere feeling; it is easy to be satisfied with sentiment. The terse phrase of the Scottish Catechism, "*Man's chief end is to glorify God,*" is well worth quoting in an age which, whether the critic be orthodox or the reverse, is apt to criticise a Christian according to his conduct. Teachers anyhow ought to teach; and they should be careful to teach in proportion. Such Scriptures as "Perfecting holiness in the fear of God" cannot in anywise be ignored without injury and loss. At the same time they should point followers after sanctification to the Lord Jesus Christ; and in expounding such Scriptures as "There is forgiveness with Thee, that Thou mayest be feared," to give a caution against servile or legal fear. Affection is afraid of giving offence.

In the chapter on "Conscience" our author quotes a saying of Dr. Newman's, that "What an Englishman calls his conscience is his self-will;" but, in the same passage, he remarks that "*superstition* warps the conscience perhaps more frequently and unexpectedly than any other cause," and this is a fair reply to the learned Romanist's.

Joy in Sorrow. By SARAH GERALDINE STOCK. Pp. 55. J. F. Shaw and Co.

We are glad to invite attention to this tiny volume. Full of good thoughts, it is a gentle teacher; and in many a circle of trial and bereavement it will do a gracious work. The tone is one of hope, and answers well to the title "*Joy in Sorrow.*" From the verses "One Less at Home" we quote the opening lines:

One less at home!
The charmed circle broken—a dear face
Missed day by day from its accustomed place;
But cleansed, and saved, and perfected by grace,
One more in Heaven!

From "Left Behind" we make three extracts:

There is no halting in our life,
And as we onward tread,
Farther we seem to pass away
From our beloved dead.

* * * * *
Time leaves them in their calm repose,
While us he onward bears,
And ever still the distance grows
That parts our life from theirs.

* * * * *
But when we reach the heavenly shore,
Most surely we shall find
That it was *they* who went before,
And *we* who stayed behind.

The Morning Song. A Ninefold Praise of Love. By J. W. PITCHFORD. Elliot Stock.

This is a handsome gift-book; as to printing, paper, and cover, delightful. The Song of Earth's Beauty, of Life, of Sorrow, of Human

Life, of the Past, of Incarnate Love, of Love's Triumph, of the Militant Host, and the Requiem Song make up the "ninefold praise." The author shows no small measure of poetic grace and power, and the tone is gratefully reverent, while much of the exposition is suggestive and soothing. It is with his descriptions of Nature that we are especially pleased, but there is so much that is good in every passage that we are glad to commend the dainty volume. The following picture is pretty and real :

The summer sunlight broods in holy calm
Broad o'er the land ; the whispering summer breeze
Quivers with mellow peals of Sabbath bells
Ringing from ivied towers, 'mid village elms,
O'er field and wood, from hill-slope, vales remote
Where but the tinkle of the sheep-bell sounds
In cawing quiet of the country morn ;
Brown homesteads buried 'mid their orchard trees
Around the village church ; beloved fane !
Lichened and gray, made sacred by the hopes
And prayers of generations.

Evangelical Truth : what it is, its Limitations, its Protests, and its Difficulties. A Paper read at Liverpool on November 15, 1883, before the North-Western Union of Evangelical Churchmen. By the Rev. CHARLES D. BELL, D.D., Rector of Cheltenham, and Hon. Canon of Carlisle. Nisbet and Co.

The conference before which this paper was read requested that it might be published : and they will take care, no doubt, that it shall be widely circulated. Canon Bell, to whose graceful pen *THE CHURCHMAN* has been much indebted, always writes with power. The close of this paper breathes spirituality, counselling trustfulness, study, self-denial, meditation and restfulness of a quiet mind. One passage may be quoted :

Met, as we are, by the difficulties of secularism on the one hand and the love of a sensuous ceremonial on the other, it cannot be too urgently insisted that our strength lies in our steadfast witness to the truth, and in the power of the Holy Ghost. Our Church's strength does not lie in its historic succession from the Apostles, however unbroken ; nor in its creeds, however Scriptural or however hallowed by the memory of ages ; nor in its ministry, however learned ; nor in our recognition and patronage by the powers that be. A Church may have all these, and yet, like the Apostolic Church of Sardis, have "only a name to live while it is dead." It may be apostolic in succession, and not in spirit ; its creeds may be only cold putrefactions of orthodox truths ; its ritual but the garish ceremonies that swathe a corpse ; and its ministry be but as the lifeless finger-post which points to a road where itself does neither lead nor follow. What the Church must have, if God is to be glorified, Christ exalted, sinners saved, and the whole body edified, is the constant, realized, living, indwelling power of the Holy Ghost.

Some Quiet Lenten Thoughts. By T. B. DOVER, Vicar of St. Agnes, Kennington Park. With a Preface by E. KING, D.D., Professor of Pastoral Theology, Oxford. W. Swan-Sonnenschein and Co. 1884.

The key-note of this little book is sounded in the following sentences on Maundy Thursday and "the first Christian Altar." (We print the sentences exactly as they are printed in the book.)

The great act of the Lord's Passion was already begun ; the word used is, "This is My Body Which is being given," "My Blood Which is being shed." The Holy Eucharist was thus linked on to the one great Oblation, which whilst it was finished on Calvary, is ever represented on High before the golden Altar, whilst we gratefully offer it day by day on earth, "ye do show the Lord's death till He come" (1 Cor. ii. 26).

The Psalter Pointed for Chanting. By the late Dr. STEPHEN ELVEY, Organist of New College and Choragus to the University of Oxford. Parker and Co.

This admirable and masterly work cost its author an amount of labour and study which to many would seem almost incredible. The difficulties to be encountered in such an undertaking are greater than may be imagined, but some idea may be formed of the magnitude of the task when we state that the talented author devoted over seven years to its preparation, and had such a grasp of his subject that he could tell anyone the position of important words in every verse, viz., whether they occurred in reciting note or the metrical part of the chant.

We most cordially invite all students of Church music—indeed, all devout Churchmen—carefully to read the very able and instructive Preface and explanatory directions to this work. We have never read a more perfect exposition of the method and spirit which should animate the choral rendering of these inspired Hymns of Praise. We can most heartily commend this arrangement of the Psalter to all those, and thanks be to God there are many now, who rejoice in aiding, so far as in them lies, in the endeavour to make our services as suitable as our weak powers will allow to the great Object of our adoration.

We hear that this Psalter has given the greatest satisfaction; choirs can easily go together, and the listeners are never pained with any wrong accent of the words. We have heard chanting from it in many village churches—indeed the writer of this notice was recently present at a village church in Lincolnshire where the Psalms were chanted more correctly than they often are where we might expect far greater ability and precision.

We feel confident that the universal adoption of Dr. Stephen Elvey's pointing would greatly tend to a more intelligent and reverential enunciation of the Psalms, and consequently help to obviate that carelessness and irreverence which so frequently mars the rendering of our choirs.

Mus. Doc.

The Day of Pentecost; or the Story of Whitsuntide. By the author of "The Week before the Crucifixion," etc.

We have much pleasure in inviting attention to this valuable little volume. It has obviously been written with much care, and it is ably written; as well for its close following of Scripture as for its spirituality of tone it will prove an edifying manual. On page 89 it might be well for some readers to put a comma after "the Lord," before "and Giver of Life." Several companion little books or tractates by the same author, "The Story of Christmas," "The Story of Easter," have been warmly commended in this magazine.

Christ the First and the Last. By the late Rev. T. D. HARFORD-BATTERSBY, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Keswick, and Honorary Canon of Carlisle. Hodder and Stoughton. 1884.

The sermons in this volume, preached within the last ten years, a prefatory note tells us, "have been selected as representative of the mature thoughts of the writer. They were not intended for publication, and consequently they appear as they were delivered, without having had the advantage of the author's corrections." There are twenty sermons, such as "Behold the Man," "Pray Without Ceasing," "Living for Christ," "Despondency Corrected." For Canon Harford-Battersby we had the most sincere respect and regard; he was a man of a humble and prayerful spirit, living near to Christ.

Reflections in Palestine. 1883. By CHARLES GEORGE GORDON. Pp. 120. Macmillan and Co. 1884.

Such is the interest taken in General Gordon that this book is sure to be read by a large number of persons. No man perhaps, at the present time, occupies so much of English thought as Gordon. Not merely in England, but in other countries, he is prominent; and books about him are eagerly sought. But for those who profess and call themselves Christians, his *Reflections in the Holy Land* must have a particular interest. Before such a book just now a critic may cease to be critical. For ourselves, we will merely remark that part of the reflections are "Topographical," and part "Religious," and that the General hopes his little book may awaken new thoughts, and stir a spirit of faithful investigation. We heartily join in this whole-hearted hero's prayer, "May God be glorified."

Memoir of Captain Prescott W. Stephens, R.N. By B. A. HEYWOOD, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge; author of "A Vacation Tour at the Antipodes," etc. Pp. 300. Nisbet and Co. 1884.

This is a thoroughly good and readable book, just the sort of biography which we are always glad to recommend. Anything written by Mr. Heywood is sure to be not only sound, but of sense and judgment; and in the life of an active Captain in the Royal Navy—an earnest Christian of the simple Gospel type—there was sure to be a good deal which will attract the general reader. The Memoir is dedicated to the officers and crew late of H.M.S. *Thetis*, and to Admirals Stirling and Lyons, and to the Pacific Squadron of the years 1879-82. It begins with the Baltic blockade in 1855; it shows us work on the East Coast of Africa, and in the Chinese War, and on the *Alkabar* Reformatory School ship; it has a chapter on the Ashantee War; it tells us of the South American Missionary Society (including mission-work at Beckenham, full of interest), and it shows us the *Thetis* voyaging in the Pacific, with sketches of Peru, Pitcairn Island, etc. Open the book where one may, some passage of bright, manly, affectionate enterprise is sure to catch the eye. We refrain from quotation, and add only that the volume is printed in delightfully clear type, and has illustrations and good maps.

The Guild of Good Life. A narrative of domestic health and economy. By BENJAMIN WARD RICHARDSON, M.D., F.R.S. Pp. 197. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

This is a volume of "The People's Library." At the request of the editorial secretary of the S.P.C.K., Dr. Richardson undertook to write the book in such a form as might be specially attractive to working men and women. The Society shadowed forth in these pages, purely ideal, might become, Dr. Richardson thinks, a working organization in every part of the country, teaching in "thrift coffee-houses" and elsewhere, wholesome truths about clean linen, economy, temperance, and so forth. On every page one meets with a practical suggestion, or a noteworthy fact. Here is a fact from the chapter on "Care for the Young":

A little baby was brought into the hospital with one of its toes nearly off. It was found by the doctor that a long hair, probably from the head of the mother, had, by accident, got wrapt once or twice round the toe; and that had been sufficient to cut quite through the toe and cause the loss of it.

Family Readings on the Gospel according to St. Luke. Consisting of short consecutive portions, comprising the whole Gospel, with a simple exposition, for daily use in Christian households. By REV. FRANCIS BOURDILLON, M.A., Vicar of Old Warden, Beds. R.T.S.

The esteemed author's books are so well known that we need hardly say more than that the present seems to us one of the best.

Influence of Mind on Mind. By JOHN BATE. T. Woolmer, 66, Pater-noster Row.

To state without prolixity, but with abundant examples and sound judgment, the Influence of Human Mind on Human Mind, of the Divine Mind on Human Mind, and of the Human Mind on Mind Divine, is no small task: this task the author, a Wesleyan minister we think, has well performed.

In the chapter on "Books" we are made familiar with good writers, their varieties of style, and though we wish that more of the great works were quoted from, the battle of books is amusing and helpful. The examples of "Conversation," advantages and influences in the conflict of opinions, remind us of sitting amidst those who converse, and noticing the influence of thought on thought, as light and power are quickened by intercourse—whether of agreement or difference. To be great in talk is worlds apart from talking greatly, and a fair study for useful and amusing speech is found in a few pages. "Public Speaking," "Education," "Music," "Arts," "The Newspaper," are variously set forth, with those differences which ensure success or lead to failure. No one can read any of these chapters without gathering instruction. They afford him who would address young men, or give lectures, sensible and agreeable examples.

The second part, "Influence of Divine Mind on Human Mind," is copiously illustrated by well-chosen incidents and quotations. The vast range of subjects, "Material Creation," "The Scriptures," "Jesus Christ," "The Holy Spirit," "Preaching," "Angels," "Disembodied Spirits," "Dreams," "Visions," "Satanic Influence," are dealt with, if not so that genius sparkles, yet so that common-sense is always at work on our behalf. This part is full of good material for all who would teach. It is a storehouse of things new and old. The evident painstaking, the large amount of reading, though too much of one school, the sustained thought, merit great praise. The trashy stuff and hasty slipshod style of much that is now printed, make welcome good honest work like this: we can take it up again and again.

The third part, "Influence of Human Mind on Divine Mind," contains several chapters on prayer. It is not the ablest part of the book; but the common-sense marking other parts is also here conspicuous. Objections to prayer are fairly stated and sufficiently answered.

The Parable of the Lock and Key. By the Rev. EDWARD HUNTINGFORD, D.C.L., Vicar of St. Saviour's, Valley End, Chobham, late Fellow of New College, Oxford. Author of "The Apocalypse with a Commentary," and other works. London: Bickers and Son, 1, Leicester Square, W.C.

The Bishop of Winchester, we observe, has written of Dr. Huntingford's works as "thoughtful, able, and free from rashness or over-confidence." The present pamphlet, on the Divine plan—"The key is Christ; the lock is Prophecy"—answers well to this description.

Thoughts and Characters. Selections from the writings of the author of "The Schönberg-Cotta Family." By A. FRIEND. S.P.C.K.

Many admirers of the various writings of the gifted author of "The Schönberg-Cotta Family" will be pleased to be informed of this "Selection." There are "Historical Characters," "Historical Scenes and Reflections," "Nature and Art," "Spiritual Life," and other chapters. The book is printed in large clear type.

The Law of the Ten Words. By J. OSWALD DYKES, D.D. Pp. 235. Hodder and Stoughton.

This is a good volume of the "Household Library of Exposition." Dr. Dykes is known as a sound and a suggestive writer.

Hours with the Bible. From the exile to Malachi, with the contemporary prophets. By CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE, D.D., Vicar of St. Mary Magdalen, Barnstaple, Devon. Hodder and Stoughton.

With this volume the Old Testament series of "Hours with the Bible" is complete. Of Dr. Geikie's erudition and ability it is not necessary now to write one word. What a pity that a divine of so high a standard, whose pen might avail so much, should be left in a benefice with an income of the smallest, but with a large population. To this interesting and important series we shall return.

The Life and Letters of Elizabeth Prentiss. By Rev. G. L. PRENTISS, D.D. With steel portrait and five illustrations. Fourth thousand. Pp. 560. Hodder and Stoughton.

A very interesting memoir—mainly an autobiography. Like "Stepping Heavenwards," it will be welcomed into Christian homes on both sides the Atlantic, and prove a blessing to many. Elizabeth Payson was born in 1818; she married the Rev. G. L. Prentiss in 1845, and entered into rest in 1878. "Stepping Heavenwards" was published in 1872.

The Communicant's Daily Help. Thoughts for daily prayer, and hints for daily life. By WALTER ABBOTT, M.A., Vicar of Paddington. S.P.C.K.

We strongly recommend this *multum in parvo*; a tiny book, full of good and useful matter. It was prepared originally for the members of St. James's Paddington Communicants' Union. Its notes are these two: (1) suggesting thoughts for daily prayer; (2) fostering sympathy and intercession. Thoroughly evangelical, it breathes a sound Church of England spirit.

Waiting is the title of a two-paged leaflet, suggestive verses by Miss MARY B. WHITING, suitable for circulation (may be had from Rev. J. B. Whiting, St. Luke's Vicarage, Ramsgate). We quote the last verse:

And so I took my lesson,
And I learn it day by day.
Though the hours be long, and my foes be strong,
Yet still I wait and pray;
For when He comes in the evening,
And holds out His arms to bless,
And questions low if my task I know,
I would answer, "Master, yes!"

Colonist's Handbooks, No. 6 (S.P.C.K.) is on New Zealand.

The fourth volume of "By-paths of Bible Knowledge," an attractive series published by the Religious Tract Society, is *Recent Discoveries on the Temple Hill at Jerusalem*, by the Rev. J. KING, M.A., authorised Lecturer to the Palestine Exploration Fund, and a good volume it is. We recently commended Mr. King's "Cleopatra's Needle."

A thoughtful and very readable little book, with illustrations, is *The Mirage of Life* (R.T.S.); short chapters, the Statesman, the Poet, the Beauty, etc. Brummel, asked what was a fair annual allowance to a young man for clothes, answered "£800 a year may do, with strict economy."

An admirable tractate by the Rev. L. B. WHITE, D.D., *The Testimony of Christ to the Old Testament Scripture* (R.T.S.), is likely to be useful. Written by so sound a divine as Dr. Borrett White it needs in these pages not a word of recommendation.

We are pleased to recommend *Notes of Lessons on St. Matthew's Gospel*, by G. M. TAIT (C.S.S. Institute).

The Wycliffe Quincentenary Commemoration has brought out several books, treatises and pamphlets, new and old.—The *Life and Times of Wycliffe*, “the Morning Star of the Reformation,” published by the Religious Tract Society, is a readable book, with illustrations, suitable for general use. From the same Society we have received *Wycliffe Anecdotes*, “Incidents and characteristics from the life of the great English Reformer,” by SAMUEL G. GREEN, D.D. With this book we are greatly pleased; it is short but full, and to the point. On the title-page is a quotation from the work of Professor Montagu Burrows: “To Wiclif we owe more than to any one person who can be mentioned—our ENGLISH LANGUAGE, our ENGLISH BIBLE, and our REFORMED RELIGION.” As to the Reformer’s name, for ourselves, we hold with Wycliffe or Wyclif, rather than Wiclif; but there are fifteen or twenty ways of spelling the name. John of Wyclif was, perhaps, the proper form. It is a pity that Lechler’s excellent work, with Lorimer’s notes, is now out of print, for the Leipsic Professor’s biography is at once highly interesting and informing. Lechler gives *Wiclif*. — *Wiclif and Hus*, from the German of Professor LOSERTH, is a volume of 360 pages. (Hodder and Stoughton.) Students will find it just now particularly helpful. We may hereafter notice this work with somewhat of fulness; but at present it may suffice to state that Book I. treats of “Wiclifism in Bohemia, down to the time of its condemnation by the Council of Constance,” while Book II. gives “Wiclifism in the writings of Hus.”—An excellent little volume by Miss HOLT, we very heartily recommend, *John de Wycliffe*, (John F. Shaw and Co.): clear, full, and good all through.

THE MONTH.

THE division on the Vote of Censure—303 to 275—showed a great defection in the Ministerial ranks.¹ Mr. Forster and Mr. Goschen spoke against the Government. The speech of Lord Randolph Churchill was, perhaps, second to none, in point and effect. In commenting on the debate, the *Guardian* says: “General Gordon should not have been sent, or should not have been deserted.”

By 238 to 127, we regret to record, the House of Commons adopted a resolution in favour of altering the law relating to marriage with a deceased wife’s sister.

The ceremony of unveiling the statue of Tyndale was performed by Lord Shaftesbury.

Canon Boyd Carpenter, we right gladly note, has been offered, and has accepted, the Bishopric of Ripon. An eloquent and really suggestive speaker and preacher, with generous sympathies, he will win his way in Yorkshire, and do much for the Church.

At the anniversary of the Church Sunday-School Institute, the chief speakers were the Chairman (the Bishop of Lichfield),

¹ Sir M. Hicks-Beach moved “That this House regrets to find that the course pursued by her Majesty’s Government has not tended to promote the success of General Gordon’s mission, and that even such steps as may be necessary to secure his personal safety are still delayed.”

and the Right Hon. A. J. Mundella, Vice-President of the Council. The Institute is doing a glorious work, and deserves to be liberally supported.

The Lower House of Canterbury, continuing its debates on the Church Courts Report, has recommended, we are sorry to see, that reference to the Bishops shall be *compulsory*. With regard to lay readers, it has suggested that the subject be brought before the clergy and laity. The proposal that unordained men should preach and conduct services in consecrated buildings was rejected. In the Upper House this action of the Lower was upheld, on a division, by ten to seven. We are glad that it is so. Such a proposal requires most serious consideration. No representative of the Evangelical School is likely to show himself stiffly conservative in regard to Lay Agency; but in dwelling upon the pressing needs of the time, we do not wish to ignore its peculiar dangers.

At the sitting of the Northern Convocation, the resolution on the extension of the Diaconate was adopted without a division. Most thankfully we record this fact. The debate and its result, in York and in Canterbury, will have surprised many. Happily, as yet, "party spirit" has not touched this movement. Many representative Evangelicals have supported it. The *Record*, however, has been rather opposed to it. THE CHURCHMAN from the first, as our readers are aware, has steadily supported it. Together with the increase of lay agency in several forms, particularly with a diocesan organization of lay helpers, we believe the extension of the Diaconate will effect incalculable benefit.

The Bishop of Liverpool, at the Church Pastoral Aid Anniversary, spoke with his old eloquence. The *Spectator* had been moralising about the decay of Evangelicalism, and the Bishop replied in his happiest way.

At the Church Missionary Society Anniversary the venerated President gave his testimony to the staunchness of the Committee. The Archbishop of York, in a powerful address, touched upon success in recent years and at the present. "God has blessed, and is blessing us."¹ Canon Hoare's spirited speech, referring to the brave man alone at Khartoum, stirred the great meeting.

¹ The *Record* says: "Even in such trying times as we have been lately experiencing, when, as the Archbishop truly urged, every branch of industry has been paralysed and every source of income more or less dried up, one institution—that which is nearest to the heart of the Evangelical section of the Church—has not suffered harm or perceptible diminution. The Associations of the Church Missionary Society throughout the land, which are the backbone of its strength and the true test of the hold which it has upon the country, notwithstanding circumstances peculiarly trying, have sent up as nearly as possible the same amount which they did last year, the highest upon record."